DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 231 828 SP 022 742

TITLE Improving the Quality of Teacher Education in Florida. Report and Recommendations of the Joint Legislative and Executive Task Force for Teacher Education Quality Improvement.
INSTITUTION Florida State Dept. of Education, Tallahassee.
PUB DATE Mar 83
NOTE 166p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Assessment; *Educational Improvement; *Educational Quality; Education Majors; Elementary Secondary Education; Preservice Teacher Education; Schools of Education; *State Standards; Statewide Planning; Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education Programs; Teacher Educators; Teacher Qualifications; Teaching (Occupation)
IDENTIFIERS *Florida

ABSTRACT

The 1982 Florida Legislature created the Joint Executive and Legislative Task Force for Teacher Education Quality Improvement to initiate a comprehensive study of Florida's teacher preparation programs and make policy recommendations for improving the quality of teacher education. This document reports on the results and findings of the task force's study. Chapter 1 provides an introduction to the project, and chapter 2 lists observations and recommendations. The third chapter discusses Florida's personnel needs. Chapter 4 delineates Florida's concern for quality in teacher education. The fifth chapter covers the organizational structure of teacher education programs in the state. Chapter 6 concentrates on the rationale for the task force's recommendations. This chapter is divided into 13 parts: (1) improving teacher education programs; (2) strengthening teacher education standards; (3) program approval and review; (4) assuring adequate funding for teacher education; (5) incentives for prospective teachers; (6) additional incentives for teachers in areas of critical shortage; (7) support for prospective minority teachers; (8) salary incentives for teachers; (9) promotion and salary criteria for teacher education faculty; (10) strengthening background for professional training; (11) impact of administrative leadership; (12) analyzing the workplace; and (13) public information campaign. Chapter 7 is the conclusion. The report also includes eight appendices, four tables, and a bibliography. (JMK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED231828

State of Florida
Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida
Ralph D. Turlington, Commissioner
Affirmative action/equal opportunity employer

IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF TEACHER EDUCATION IN FLORIDA

Report and Recommendations of the
Joint Legislative and Executive
Task Force for Teacher Education
Quality Improvement

FLORIDA: A STATE OF EDUCATIONAL DISTINCTION. "On a statewide average, educational achievement in the State of Florida will equal that of the upper quartile of states within five years, as indicated by commonly accepted criteria of attainment." Adopted, State Board of Education, Jan. 20, 1981

This public document was promulgated at an annual cost of $4,072.53 or $4.07 per copy to report on the findings and recommendations of the Joint Executive and Legislative Task Force for Teacher Education Quality Improvement.

March 1983

SP 022 742

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Linda Recio

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION PLANNING COMMISSION
KNOTT BUILDING
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32301

TASK FORCE FOR
TEACHER EDUCATION
QUALITY IMPROVEMENT

Telephone (904) 488-0981

March 1, 1983

The Honorable Bob Graham
Governor of Florida

The Honorable Ralph D. Turlington
Commissioner of Education

The Honorable Barbara Newell
Chancellor of the State University System

The Honorable Curtis Peterson
President, Florida Senate

The Honorable Lee Moffitt
Speaker, House of Representatives

The Honorable Jack Gordon
Chairman, Senate Education Committee

The Honorable Eleanor Weinstock
Chairman, House K-12 Education Committee

Ladies and Gentlemen:

On behalf of the Joint Executive and Legislative Task Force for Teacher Education Quality Improvement, I am pleased to forward this Task Force Report. As specified in the legislation, the Task Force has addressed a variety of significant issues in the area of teacher education and has developed recommendations aimed at strengthening teacher education programs and standards.

We believe Florida has an excellent opportunity to establish a national leadership position in the reform of teacher education and the suggestions provided in this report certainly represent a good start. Florida needs quality education, highly talented and skilled teachers, and academic and rigorous teacher education programs.

Affirmative action/equal opportunity employer

I would like to extend the membership's gratitude for the opportunity to serve in this effort. Indeed, it has been an important challenge for each of us. We believe that this report can provide the basis for legislative and other policy decisions necessary for improving the quality of teacher education over the next several years. The Task Force membership will remain available to assist you in any manner which may be necessary to help implement these recommendations.

Respectfully submitted,

A.J. Henriquez
Chairperson

AJH/mm

JOINT EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE TASK FORCE
FOR TEACHER EDUCATION QUALITY IMPROVEMENT

MEMBERS

Armando J. Henriquez, Chairperson
Governor's Commission on Secondary Schools
Superintendent, Monroe County Schools

Miriam Arnold
Florida Vocational Association
Vocational Coordinator, Escambia County Schools

Ida Baker
State Community College Coordinating Board
Principal, Cape Coral High School

Wendy Cheyney
Faculty, College of Education
Associate Professor, Florida International University

Pat Frank
The Florida Senate

James Gardener
Postsecondary Education Planning Commission
Assistant to President, Nova University

Lynn Gold
Florida Association of Teacher Educators
TEC Director, Volusia County Schools

Fred Haushalter
Florida Association of School Administrators
Principal, Woodham High School

Jeffrey Hoffman
Florida Association of Teacher Educators
Associate Professor, Florida State University

Donald Jones
Chairman, State Board of Independent Colleges and Universities
Attorney at law

William Katzenmeyer, Vice Chairperson
Dean, College of Education
University of South Florida

Elizabeth Kentosh
Classroom Teacher
Niceville Senior High School

Marcia Mann
Faculty, College of Education
Associate Professor, University of South Florida

James McCartney, Vice Chairperson
Dean, College of Education
Chief Academic Officer and Dean, Biscayne College

Robert McKelvey
Florida School Board Association
Member, Okaloosa County School Board

Barbara Moore
Florida School Board Association
Member, Okaloosa County School Board

Paul Prosperi
Citizen-at-large
Attorney, Barnett & Alagia

Wray Register
Florida Education Council

90 v 5

MEMBERS

(Cont.)

Samuel Ryle
Classroom Teacher
Belleview Middle School

Doris Sanders
State Advisory Committee for the Education of Exceptional Students
Director, Polk County Exceptional Student Education (Retired)

Frank Scruggs
Board of Regents
Attorney, Steel Hector & Davis

David Smith, Vice Chairperson
Education Standards Commission
Dean, College of Education, University of Florida

John Terrell
Florida Association of School Administrators
Superintendent, Hardee County Schools

Ralph Turlington
Department of Education
Commissioner of Education

Eleanor Weinstock
The Florida House of Representatives

TASK FORCE STAFF

Richard Alterman, *Project Director*

Linda Recio, *Assistant Project Director*

Sue P. Freedman

Jeffrey Sharkey

Ellen Leddy

Mariann Maender

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL iii

TASK FORCE MEMBERSHIP v

CHAPTER ONE 1
Introduction

CHAPTER TWO 6
Observations and Recommendations

CHAPTER THREE 21
Personnel Needs in Florida

CHAPTER FOUR 23
The Concern for Quality in Teacher Education

CHAPTER FIVE 31
The Organizational Structure of Teacher Education Programs in Florida

CHAPTER SIX 43
Rationale for Recommendations

I. Improving Teacher Education Programs 43
- A. Subject Matter Competencies
- B. Courses Related to Florida's Social Contexts
- C. Clinical/Field Experiences
- D. Master's Degree Programs for Teacher Education
- E. Relationships between Teacher Education Programs and the Beginning Teacher Education Program
- F. Staff Development for Teacher Education Faculty
- G. University Commitment to Teacher Education

II. Strengthening Teacher Education Standards. 56
- A. Strengthening the Florida Teacher Certification Examination
- B. Certification of Distinguished Teachers
- C. Course Requirements for Specialization Certification
- D. Certification of Vocational Education Teachers
- E. Teacher Education Program Admissions Requirement

III. Program Approval and Program Review 65

IV. Assuring Adequate Funding for Teacher Education 69

V. Incentives for Prospective Teachers 72
- A. Scholarships/Loans
- B. Magnet Program for Talented Teachers

VI. Additional Incentives for Teachers in Areas of Critical Shortage. 75

VII. Support for Prospective Minority Teachers 78

VIII. Salary Incentives for Teachers. 80

IX. Promotion and Salary Criteria for Teacher Education Faculty 81

X. Strengthening Background for Professional Training. . . . 82

XI. Impact of Administrative Leadership 86

XII. Analyzing the Workplace 87

XIII. Public Information Campaign 88

CHAPTER SEVEN. 91
Conclusion

BIBLIOGRAPHY 92

APPENDICES 99

A. Task Force Meeting Agendas

B. Individuals Who Made Presentations to Task Force

C. Executive Summaries of Consultants' Reports

D. Individuals Testifying at Public Hearing

E. Summary Charts Related to Teacher Education

F. 1982-83 Teacher Salary Ranges

G. Community College Education-Related Course Offerings

H. Task Force Surveys

TABLES

Selected Areas of Critical Teacher Need for Florida 21

Secondary Education: Program Components 39

Course Recommendations for Academic Specialization in Mathematics 41

Elementary Education: Program Components 42

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The 1982 Florida Legislature created the Joint Executive and Legislative Task Force for Teacher Education Quality Improvement to initiate a comprehensive study of Florida's teacher preparation programs and make policy recommendations related to improving the quality of teacher education. The legislative intent delineated in Chapter 82-136 clearly focuses on the preservice aspect of teacher education:

> The Legislature recognizes that past attempts to improve teacher education have been fragmented and lacking in clearly stated objectives. Piecemeal approaches have not made a significant impact. Not until the quality of teacher education is examined in a systematic and comprehensive manner can a variety of strategies for fundamental improvement be thoroughly considered. The Legislature hereby encourages educators of teachers to critically review their current practices and to examine the knowledge base which is already in existence, but which is inadequately utilized. The strengthening of teacher education programs will require greater coordination between the schools and universities than any other single issue.

Issues

The legislation charged the Task Force to address at least the following sixteen issues related to teacher education.

1. Selection procedures (beginning with admission standards) throughout the entire process of teacher preparation
2. The secondary school curriculum as it relates to the knowledge and skills needed for college entrance
3. The content and process of preservice and graduate teacher education programs
4. The variety, intensity, duration, and timing of field experiences
5. Differential funding for colleges of education
6. Review of program approval procedures
7. Staff development for university personnel
8. College and university salary and promotion procedures that recognize faculty service to schools and school districts
9. Incentives to attract teachers in areas where there is a critical shortage
10. Elimination of unnecessary duplication of teacher education programs and specialities
11. The impact of administrative and supervisory

leadership on the quality of teachers
12. Sensitivity to multicultural concerns and racial and sexual equity
13. Role and scope of community colleges as they relate to teacher education
14. Role and scope of the private sector as they relate to teacher education
15. Teacher certification
16. The public image of the educational community

Membership and Organizational Structure

As specified in the Legislation, twenty-five members representing a broad spectrum of educators and citizens were appointed to the Task Force by the Governor, the Speaker of the House, and the President of the Senate. A list of the membership appears on page v.

At the first meeting, the Task Force elected Dr. Armando Henriquez as the group's chairperson. At the next meeting, members of the Task Force were divided into three committees: governance, personnel, and program. Each committee then elected a vice-chairperson: Dr. William Katzenmeyer-governance, Dr. James McCartney-personnel, and Dr. David Smith-program. The Task Force was assisted by three full time and one half time professional staff and a full time secretary.

The Task Force held a total of nine meetings from August 30, 1982 to March 4, 1983. All meeting agendas can be found in Appendix A.

Assembling of Background Materials

In order to improve their understanding of the dynamics of teacher education and the entangling network of agencies and groups which influence programs, the Task Force spent the initial part of its meeting schedule investigating and educating itself in the background of the issues. This was accomplished in a number of ways.

First, staff conducted a library and ERIC search and disseminated a wide variety of nationally recognized articles, monographs, and reports concerned with recent developments in teacher education. (A complete bibliography can be found on page 92.) These studies covered a wide variety of topics including the role of the liberal arts in teacher education; the case for extended programs; teacher competence; academic skills of education majors; teacher education reform; state policies and the education of teachers; and problems with teaching as a profession.

Second, extensive and frequent contact was maintained with appropriate officials in the Florida Department of Education, particularly the Office of Teacher Education, Certification, and Staff Development. In addition, approximately thirteen state educational agencies were consulted, either by examining written materials sent by officials from these agencies or interviewing them directly by telephone. States which were contacted represented those commonly identified as having established recent policies aimed at improving teacher education programs.

Third, officials and faculty from universities and colleges of education throughout the country were contacted for information about innovative approaches to teacher preparation as well as about obstacles and problems frequently encountered in attempts to reform teacher education programs.

Fourth, the Task Force contacted national organizations interested in or associated with teacher education, including the Education Commission of the States, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, the National Education Association, the American Federation of Teachers, the Chief State School Officers and the United States Department of Education.

Fifth, to better understand the legislative intent behind the formation of the Task Force and to receive feedback on the group's progress, staff met frequently with appropriate legislative aides. These meetings permitted the Task Force to focus on only those issues which would receive legislative attention and to keep informed of the research and findings of those state-level groups whose investigations dealt with similar, overlapping, or complementary issues. These included the Speaker's Task Force on Mathematics, Science, and Computer Education in the area of critical shortages; the Florida Council for Educational Management in the area of administrative leadership; the Governor's Commission on Secondary Schools on the issue of high school curriculum; and the Education Standards Commission in the area of inservice education.

Presentations and Testimony

The Task Force scheduled, when appropriate, testimony from experts and officials both in Florida and the nation whom they believed could address the sixteen issues comprehensively. Officials from the Department of Education and the Board of Regents, the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida, the Florida Association of Teacher Educators, the Education Standards Commission and both of Florida's professional teacher associations provided insights into the variety of networks which influence teacher education programs. To increase their understanding of the placement of teacher education programs in a university context, the Task Force heard presentations from a Dean of Arts and Sciences, two university vice-presidents and the Chancellor of the State University System. A member of the Florida Senate was invited to present the legislature's perception of the areas of need and direction for reform in teacher education. The special needs of the state's diverse teacher education programs were expressed by representatives from the private sector and from institutions representing large minority populations.

Finally, the Task Force learned about national agendas for reform in teacher education from prominent and recognized experts in the area including Dr. Robert B. Howsam, Professor and former Dean, College of Education, University of Houston; Dr. Dale P. Scannell, Dean, School of Education, the University of Kansas; Dr. Jack L. Gant, President, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education; and Dr. B.O. Smith, Professor Emeritus, University of Illinois and University of

South Florida. A complete list of presenters can be found in Appendix B.

Data Gathering

Two consultants with expertise in funding and certification were contracted to examine these issues. They were Dr. Nancy Zimpher of Ohio State University, who has conducted several studies on accreditation and certification, and Dr. Bruce Peseau of the University of Alabama, who is nationally recognized as an authority in the funding of colleges of education. Both consultant reports were used by the Task Force in consideration of recommendations in funding and teacher certification and can be provided upon request. Executive summaries of both reports can be found in Appendix C.

In order to secure the most accurate information available on Florida's preservice teacher education programs, surveys were developed and distributed to the following groups: deans, directors, and chairpersons of all teacher education programs; chairpersons of elementary, secondary and exceptional student education programs; and every teacher education program faculty member in both public and private colleges and universities. Responses to the survey were secured from 80 percent of the state's approved programs and from approximately 40 percent of the faculty surveyed. Catalogues were also obtained from each of the 26 teacher training institutions and comparisons made of their teacher education program requirements.

At the request of the Task Force, Board of Regents staff conducted a transcript study to determine the quantity and level of academic coursework taken by various students planning to be secondary education teachers. In addition, on-site interviews were conducted with students and faculty to gather first hand information on teacher education programs. These included personnel at Florida State University, the University of West Florida, Jacksonville University, the University of North Florida, the University of Central Florida, Rollins College, and Florida A & M University.

Data on teacher education program enrollment and projected school district needs were obtained from the Board of Regents, Florida Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Florida Association of School Personnel Administrators, and the Education Standards Commission. Certification requirements and criteria for and examples of the program approval process were secured from the Department of Education. Standards for subject matter competence were gathered from appropriate national associations including the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, National Council for the Social Studies, National Science Teachers Association and National Council of Teachers of English.

Consideration of Recommendations

After the three committees became operational and deliberation began on the issues, committee chairpersons realized that additional structure was needed. With this time frame, a writing committee consisting of the chairperson, vice-chairpersons, and staff, was formed to develop preliminary recommendations for full Task Force consideration. The writing committee presented the first set of 13 draft recommendations at the December 5-6th Task Force meeting. After reaching general consensus on several of these recommendations and reviewing other recommendations from the membership, staff prepared the rationale for these recommendations, incorporating that data base described in the last section. This process of developing and refining additional recommendations and rationale for each continued into February.

On February 10th, a public hearing was conducted in Tallahassee of which the Task Force listened to testimony on the group's first draft of recommendations. Testimony was presented at this hearing by representatives from the Department of Education, one of the teachers associations, and from several public and private teacher education programs. On February 11th the Task Force discussed the public testimony, made appropriate changes and then approved by consensus all but one of the recommendations found in this report. On that recommendation where consensus was not reached a minority statement was filed and can be found on page 51. A list of those individuals who testified at the public hearing can be found in Appendix D.

The Task Force held its final meeting on March 4th, where it approved the final report and formally submitted it to the Legislature as charged.

CHAPTER TWO

OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Task Force identified twelve general observations and concerns they believed should form the conceptual framework for the development of recommendations aimed at improving the quality of Florida's teacher preparation programs. These statements both encompass the sixteen issues assigned to the Task Force in statute by the Legislature and represent that body's intent for the Task Force to examine teacher education programs from a comprehensive reference point.

Observations and Concerns on Teacher Education

The quality of education in public schools can rise no higher than the qualifications of the teachers who educate the youth of our state.

Florida's teacher education programs will graduate less than 40 percent of new teachers hired in Florida next year.

Standards which assure that only high quality teachers will be certified must be established. A diversity of approaches to teacher education should be encouraged and the quality of teacher education programs evaluated against the extent to which graduates meet the standards identified.

In order to adequately prepare students to enter a complex American society, better trained teachers are needed to take into account these complexities, which include an increase in Florida's cultural diversity, a technological explosion, high drug and alcohol abuse, and a dramatic rise in single parent families.

Both the esteem and salary levels of professional teachers need to be raised.

Florida does not have an adequate supply of qualified teachers in all areas, nor does the state have sufficient incentives to attract talented teachers into subject areas where shortages exist.

There is a substantial decline in the number of minorities entering the profession.

Teacher preparation programs do not appear to be a high priority in Florida's universities. Evidence includes low funding allocations, lack of designation for use of Quality Improvement Funds, and procedures for promotion and tenure which fail in practice to recognize service to public schools.

-The teacher education student-faculty ratio in university funding formulas are generally the highest of all academic disciplines.
-Program review and funding are not linked.
-There is little apparent relationship between appropriations to ensure minimum quality programs and university expenditures for programs.

Generally speaking, Florida's preservice teacher education programs need to be both reconceptualized and redesigned.

-A traditional four year program may not give sufficient time to provide Florida's prospective teachers with the comprehensive, quality preservice teacher training program needed for effective classroom teaching.
-Results on the Teacher Certification Examination suggest that some of Florida's prospective teachers are inadequately prepared in some of the state's teacher preparation programs.

Several research studies suggest that the teacher's workplace is unrewarding and creates a professional environment not conducive to retaining quality teachers.

A comprehensive and interrelated strategy for strengthening teacher education standards and improving teacher education in Florida is needed, for a piecemeal approach will not work.

The professional preparation programs and standards for certification of school administrators should be improved to better prepare principals to become effective instructional leaders.

Recommendations

From this comprehensive list the Task Force was able to develop thirteen categories of recommendations aimed at six general domains. It was the intent of the Task Force for these domains to represent the various areas which have been recognized as having an influence on

Florida's teacher education programs. The rationale for each recommendation can be found in Chapter Six.

1. Teacher Preparation

The first domain directs recommendations toward encouraging the state's teacher education programs to be reconceptualized and redesigned. The Task Force focused their quality improvement suggestions on increasing subject matter competencies, requiring that programs be based on clinical and field experiences, providing incentives for some of the state's approved public programs to offer five year extended programs which culminate in a master's degree, requesting funds for staff development, and calling for universities to make their commitment to teacher education programs more visible. The Task Force believes that implementation of these suggestions will help the state meet the educational obligations anticipated for teachers in the twenty-first century.

Subject Matter Competencies

SUBJECT MATTER COMPETENCE FOR ELEMENTARY AND SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS, PARTICULARLY BUT NOT EXCLUSIVELY IN READING, MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE, NEEDS TO BE STRENGTHENED AND DEMONSTRATED.

PROSPECTIVE MIDDLE AND SECONDARY TEACHERS SEEKING CERTIFICATION IN A CONTENT AREA SHOULD TAKE A BROADLY BASED PROGRAM APPROPRIATE TO EXISTING SECONDARY CURRICULUM AND EQUIVALENT IN HOURS TO A MAJOR IN THE CONTENT AREA.

Course Components Related to Florida's Social Contexts

GRADUATES OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS SHOULD HAVE A COMPONENT RELATED TO THE VARYING SOCIAL CONTEXTS WHICH EXIST IN FLORIDA SUCH AS URBAN OR RURAL SOCIOLOGY, SOCIOLOGY OF THE FAMILY, CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY, OR MINORITIES IN AMERICAN SOCIETY.

Clinical and Field Experiences

BY THE END OF THE FIRST SEMESTER OF THE JUNIOR YEAR OF A TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM, EACH STUDENT SHOULD HAVE COMPLETED A FIELD EXPERIENCE BASED ON WORKING WITH YOUTH IN A STRUCTURED AND SUPERVISED SCHOOL SETTING.

CLINICAL AND FIELD EXPERIENCES SHOULD BE INCORPORATED INTO VIRTUALLY ALL ASPECTS OF THE PROFESSIONAL PROGRAM.

CLINICAL COMPONENTS WITH A STUDENT-TEACHER RATIO OF 12:1 NEED TO BE ADEQUATELY FUNDED.

Master's Degree Programs for Teacher Education

INCREASED SOCIETAL DEMANDS, THE NECESSITY FOR A WELL-ROUNDED GENERAL EDUCATION AND MASTERY OF SUBJECT MATTER, A RAPIDLY EXPANDING KNOWLEDGE BASE FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING AND THE ECONOMIC ADVANTAGES ASSOCIATED WITH THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMPETENT PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS SUGGEST THAT THE YOUTH OF OUR STATE SHOULD HAVE THE BENEFIT OF TEACHERS WHO ARE PRODUCTS OF MORE RIGOROUS, SOPHISTICATED PREPARATION PROGRAMS.

THE STATE SHOULD PILOT AT LEAST THREE MASTER'S DEGREE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS ON THE BASIS OF COMPETITIVE PROPOSALS. THE PROPOSALS SHOULD SHOW EVIDENCE THAT PROGRAMS HAVE BEEN RECONCEPTUALIZED AND REDESIGNED TO:

-HAVE A STRONG GENERAL EDUCATION COMPONENT
-HAVE A SIGNIFICANT COMPONENT RELATED TO ACADEMIC SPECIALIZATION
-HAVE A PROFESSIONAL COMPONENT BASED ON PEDAGOGICAL THEORY AND CLINICAL AND FIELD EXPERIENCES
-REQUIRE CANDIDATES TO BE PROFICIENT IN THE USE OF COMPUTERS IN INSTRUCTION
-REQUIRE CANDIDATES FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHING TO HAVE A STUDENT INTERNSHIP IN AT LEAST TWO GRADE LEVELS (ONE EACH IN THE PRIMARY AND INTERMEDIATE LEVELS)
-REQUIRE CANDIDATES FOR SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHING TO HAVE A STUDENT INTERNSHIP IN AT LEAST TWO AREAS WITHIN THE SUBJECT MATTER DISCIPLINE AND AT THE INTERMEDIATE AND SENIOR HIGH LEVELS
-REQUIRE CANDIDATES IN EXCEPTIONAL STUDENT EDUCATION TO HAVE A STUDENT INTERNSHIP IN AT LEAST TWO APPROPRIATE AREAS, ONE OF WHICH MAY BE IN A REGULAR CLASSROOM
-CULMINATE IN A MASTER'S DEGREE.

IN ADDITION TO COMPETITIVE PROPOSALS, THE LEGISLATURE SHOULD DIRECT THE STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM TO MAKE THE RECONCEPTUALIZATION AND REDESIGN OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS A MAJOR PRIORITY FOR NEW OR SEPARATE QUALITY IMPROVEMENT FUNDS.

Relationship between Teacher Education Programs and the Beginning Teacher Program

TEACHER EDUCATION FACULTY SHOULD HAVE AN INTEGRAL ROLE IN THE BEGINNING TEACHER PROGRAM.

TO HELP IN TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT, LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS SHOULD PROVIDE COLLEGES OF EDUCATION WITH APPROPRIATE DATA ON GRADUATES ENROLLED IN THE BEGINNING TEACHER PROGRAM, SUCH AS PEDAGOGICAL SKILL PERFORMANCE AND SUBJECT MATTER COMPETENCY.

ALL SUPERVISING TEACHERS AND UNIVERSITY FACULTY INVOLVED WITH STUDENT TEACHERS SHOULD BE ABLE TO MEET CRITERIA ESTABLISHED FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE BEGINNING TEACHER PROGRAM.

FACULTY WHO ARE INVOLVED IN THE PRESERVICE EDUCATION OF TEACHERS SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO SERVE PERIODICALLY ON A SCHOOL-BASED BEGINNING TEACHER SUPPORT TEAM. WHEN APPROPRIATE, THIS SERVICE SHOULD BE RECOGNIZED AS A CRITERION FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE.

Staff Development for Teacher Education

TEACHER EDUCATION FACULTY, WHERE APPROPRIATE, SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED TO RETURN TO THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS FOR AT LEAST ONE SEMESTER ON A PERIODIC BASIS. SERVICE COULD BE PROVIDED AS A CLASSROOM TEACHER, AS A DISTRICT OR SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR, AS AN INSERVICE EDUCATOR OR IN A VARIETY OF OTHER WAYS. AN AGREEMENT SHOULD BE ARTICULATED BETWEEN THE SCHOOL DISTRICT AND THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND SHOULD INCLUDE SHARED COSTS FOR THE SABBATICAL, FUNDS FOR TRAVEL, COLLABORATION WITH OTHER DISTRICTS, FACULTY EXCHANGE, AND OTHER NECESSARY COMPONENTS.

FUNDS SHOULD BE ALLOCATED TO COLLEGES OF EDUCATION FOR FACULTY STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES. FUNDS COULD BE USED FOR SCHOOL-RELATED PROJECTS, RESEARCH, OR FOR TRAINING RELATED TO MANDATED CHANGES IN PUBLIC SCHOOL PROGRAMS.

University Commitment to Teacher Education

UNIVERSITIES SHOULD GIVE A HIGHER PRIORITY TO TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND SUBMIT A PLAN TO THE BOARD OF REGENTS DESCRIBING IN DETAIL HOW TEACHER EDUCATION WILL BE MADE MORE PROMINENT. THE PLAN SHOULD AT LEAST:
-EVALUATE CURRENT PROGRAMS FOR EFFECTIVENESS
-OUTLINE WAYS TO STRENGTHEN COOPERATIVE EFFORTS BETWEEN COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND OTHER FACULTY
-BE RELEVANT AND RESPONSIVE TO THE UNIQUE NEEDS AND RESOURCES ASSOCIATED WITH EACH INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION
-PROVIDE DETAILED IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES.

IN AN EFFORT TO MAKE TEACHER EDUCATION MORE PROMINENT, FUNDS SHOULD BE ALLOCATED TO SUPPORT THE DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION OF THESE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

2. Standards of Quality

The second domain relates to strengthening the standards of quality for teacher education programs as well as for the certification of prospective teachers. The Task Force firmly believed that if the state's public schools are to employ competent and talented teachers standards must be established which assure that only high quality teachers will be certified, and the quality of teacher education programs must be evaluated against the extent to which graduates meet those standards. Therefore these recommendations, are directed towards strengthening teacher certification area specialization requirements, program review and program approval processes, and the Florida Teacher Certification Examination.

Strengthening Florida's Teacher Certification Examination

THE PROFESSIONAL QUALIFYING EXAMINATION WHICH IS USED TO CERTIFY FLORIDA TEACHERS MUST BE UPGRADED AND MADE MORE RIGOROUS. THE TASK FORCE RECOMMENDS THAT THE EDUCATION STANDARDS COMMISSION INITIATE THE FOLLOWING:

EITHER THE BASIC SKILLS COMPONENT (THE READING, WRITING, AND MATHEMATICS SECTIONS) OF THE CURRENT FLORIDA TEACHER EXAMINATION SHOULD BE DESIGNED TO BE MORE RIGOROUS OR OTHER VALIDATED EXAMINATIONS SHOULD BE CONSIDERED AS TO THEIR SUITABILITY FOR USE IN MEASURING THE BASIC SKILLS.

THE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION COMPONENT OF THE TEACHER CERTIFICATION EXAMINATION SHOULD BE REWRITTEN AND BASED ON VALIDATED RESEARCH. THE REDEVELOPED TEST SHOULD INVOLVE A HALF OR FULL DAY EXAMINATION COVERING THE STUDENT'S KNOWLEDGE OF SUCH SUBJECTS AS THE RESEARCH ON EFFECTIVE TEACHING, EDUCATIONAL MEASUREMENT, SCHOOL LAW, MAINSTREAMING PRINCIPLES, CLASSROOM DISCIPLINE, EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY, HISTORICAL AND SOCIAL TRENDS, VARYING SOCIAL CONTEXTS IN FLORIDA, COMPUTER PROFICIENCY, AND SUCH OTHER AREAS AS HAVE BEEN VALIDATED.

THE EXAMINATION SHOULD INCLUDE A SUBJECT AREA COMPONENT. ALL TEACHERS SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO PRESENT EVIDENCE OF SCORES EARNED AT A SUITABLE STANDARD ON A VALIDATED SUBJECT TEST(S) APPROPRIATE TO THE CANDIDATE'S PROPOSED TEACHING FIELD (FOR EXAMPLE, BIOLOGY, FRENCH, EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION).

WHEN THE FLORIDA TEACHER CERTIFICATION EXAMINATION HAS BECOME MORE RIGOROUS, THE STATE SHOULD DROP THE REQUIREMENT THAT 80 PERCENT OF THE GRADUATES OF ALL STATE-APPROVED TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS MUST PASS THIS EXAMINATION IN ORDER FOR THE PROGRAM TO RETAIN STATE APPROVAL.

Course Requirements for Specialization Certification

ALL COURSE REQUIREMENTS FOR SPECIALIZATION AREA CERTIFICATION, PARTICULARLY THOSE RELATED TO SUBJECT MATTER COMPETENCE, SHOULD BE REVIEWED AND STRENGTHENED. TO ACCOMPLISH THIS, THE TASK FORCE RECOMMENDS THE FOLLOWING:

THE EDUCATION STANDARDS COMMISSION SHOULD CREATE AN ACCELERATED TIMETABLE WHICH REQUIRES SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF REQUIREMENTS IN EACH SPECIALIZATION AREA.

THE EDUCATION STANDARDS COMMISSION SHOULD DEVELOP STANDARDS FOR THE REVISED REQUIREMENTS WHICH INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:
-FOR SECONDARY EDUCATION, A GOAL SHOULD BE SET FOR EQUATING SUBJECT AREA COURSE REQUIREMENTS TO THOSE SPECIFIED FOR LIBERAL ARTS MAJORS. FOR EXAMPLE, A SECONDARY MATHEMATICS EDUCATION TEACHER SHOULD HAVE AN EQUIVALENT NUMBER OF HOURS IN MATHEMATICS AS AN INDIVIDUAL WITH A LIBERAL ARTS MATHEMATICS DEGREE.

-SUBJECT MATTER AND PEDAGOGICAL REQUIREMENTS FOR ELEMENTARY, EARLY CHILDHOOD, AND EXCEPTIONAL STUDENT EDUCATION CERTIFICATION SHOULD BE STRENGTHENED. FOR EXAMPLE, A COURSE IN COLLEGE ALGEBRA OR HIGHER MATHEMATICS SHOULD BE REQUIRED.

THE LEGISLATURE SHOULD ALLOCATE FUNDS TO THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION TO INVOLVE CONSULTANTS AND TEACHERS TO HELP FORMULATE THE REVISED REQUIREMENTS FOR SUBMISSION TO THE EDUCATION STANDARDS COMMISSION.

REVIEW OF THE FIRST SET OF REVISED SPECIALIZATION AREA REQUIREMENTS BY THE EDUCATION STANDARDS COMMISSION SHOULD COMMENCE NO LATER THAN JANUARY 1985.

THE NEW STANDARDS, TIMETABLE, AND REVISED REQUIREMENTS SHOULD BE SUBMITTED TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR APPROVAL.

THE LEGISLATURE SHOULD DIRECT THE EDUCATION STANDARDS COMMISSION TO COMPLETE THE EXAMINATION OF ALL CURRENT COURSE REQUIREMENTS FOR SPECIALIZATION CERTIFICATION NO LATER THAN JULY 1, 1990. ANY SPECIALIZATION NOT REVISED AND READOPTED BY THIS DATE WILL BE DISCONTINUED.

THEREAFTER, EACH CERTIFICATION SPECIALIZATION MUST BE REAPPROVED EVERY 10 YEARS.

Certification of Non-Degree Vocational Education Teachers

TO ENSURE THAT NON-DEGREE VOCATIONAL TEACHERS ARE APPROPRIATELY CERTIFIED, AND THAT SUCH A CERTIFICATION PROCESS IS SENSITIVE TO THE RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION DEMANDS OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS FOR SUCH SKILLED TEACHERS, THE TASK FORCE RECOMMENDS THAT THE CREDENTIALING PROCESS REQUIRE THE CANDIDATE TO:
-HAVE COMPLETED A HIGH SCHOOL DEGREE;
-HAVE SIX YEARS OF SUCCESSFUL, VERIFIED WORK EXPERIENCE IN THE SPECIFIC OCCUPATIONAL AREA FOR WHICH CERTIFICATION IS REQUESTED (SIX WEEKS OF THAT EXPERIENCE MUST BE WITHIN THE LAST FIVE YEARS AND TWO YEARS OF THAT EXPERIENCE MUST BE AT THE JOURNEYMAN OR SKILLED LEVEL);
-SUCCESSFULLY PASS A NATIONALLY VALIDATED OCCUPATIONAL PROFICIENCY EXAMINATION COVERING THE CONTENT AREAS OF OCCUPATIONAL PROFICIENCY, READING, WRITING, AND TECHNICAL MATHEMATICS SKILLS; AND
-SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETE THE BEGINNING TEACHER PROGRAM.

Teacher Education Program Admissions Requirement

FOLLOWING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COLLEGE LEVEL ACADEMIC SKILLS TEST AND COMPARABLE STANDARDS FOR ADMISSION TO THE JUNIOR YEAR, THE LEGISLATURE SHOULD ELIMINATE THE CURRENT TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM ADMISSIONS REQUIREMENT SET FORTH IN SECTION 240.529, FLORIDA STATUTES, RELATED TO THE FORTIETH PERCENTILE SCORE ON THE SAT/ACT.

FOR THE SAKE OF CONSISTENCY, ALL APPLICANTS TO STATE-APPROVED TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS AT PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO PASS THE CLAST TEST BEFORE ADMISSION. IN THESE CASES THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND THE ELIGIBLE INSTITUTIONS SHOULD NEGOTIATE AN AGREEMENT THAT WOULD ASSURE THAT THE TEST IS AVAILABLE EITHER DIRECTLY THROUGH THE INSTITUTIONS OR ON A CONTRACTUAL BASIS WITH A STATE COMMUNITY COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY.

Program Approval and Program Review

THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION PROGRAM APPROVAL PROCESS AND THE BOARD OF REGENTS PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS SHOULD BE COMBINED AND BASED ON A COMMON SET OF VALIDATED PROGRAM EVALUATION CRITERIA WHICH REFLECT THE MOST INFORMED INDICATORS OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM QUALITY. IN ORDER TO ACCOMPLISH THIS, THE TASK FORCE OFFERS THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS:

THE EDUCATION STANDARDS COMMISSION, WORKING WITH THE BOARD OF REGENTS, THE STATE BOARD OF INDEPENDENT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, AND OTHER APPROPRIATE GROUPS SHOULD PREPARE A SET OF QUALITY INDICATORS WHICH ARE TO BE ADDRESSED IN PROGRAM APPROVAL AND PROGRAM REVIEW EVALUATIONS OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

STAFF OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, THE BOARD OF REGENTS, AND THE STATE BOARD OF INDEPENDENT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, SHOULD PREPARE NEW STATE BOARD RULES, BASED ON THE INDICATOR AREAS IDENTIFIED BY THE EDUCATION STANDARDS COMMISSION. THESE DRAFT RULES SHOULD SPECIFY THE INDICATORS, PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION BASED ON THE INDICATORS, AND THE CRITERIA WHICH MUST BE MET ON EACH INDICATOR FOR APPROVAL TO BE AWARDED. THE DRAFT RULES SHOULD BE REVIEWED BY ALL OF THE STATE'S TEACHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS AND APPROVED BY THE COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION.

THE DRAFT RULES SHOULD BE SUBMITTED TO THE EDUCATION STANDARDS COMMISSION FOR APPROVAL AND SUBMISSION TO THE STATE BOARD.

NEW STATE BOARD RULES GOVERNING THE COMBINED PROGRAM APPROVAL AND REVIEW PROCESS SHOULD BE IMPLEMENTED BY MARCH 1, 1984 AND SUBSEQUENTLY AT FIVE YEAR INTERVALS.

THE COMBINED PROGRAM APPROVAL AND PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS FOR STATE APPROVED TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS SHOULD RECUR IN FIVE YEAR CYCLES, BEGINNING NO LATER THAN JANUARY, 1985.

3. Funding

The third area addresses problems in funding teacher preparation programs and focuses recommendations both on the use of Quality Improvement Funds and on the establishment of a funding system which would more effectively direct monies to program needs and quality improvement.

Assuring Adequate Funding for Teacher Education

A NEW FUNDING SYSTEM FOR TEACHER EDUCATION BINDING LEGISLATIVE CONSEQUENCE WITH UNIVERSITY ACTION SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED. THE TASK FORCE THEREFORE RECOMMENDS CHANGES IN THE SYSTEM FOR FUNDING TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

IN ADDITION, EFFORTS TO IMPROVE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS SHOULD BE A MAJOR PRIORITY FOR NEW OR SEPARATE QUALITY IMPROVEMENT FUNDS FOR THE NEXT SEVERAL YEARS. THESE FUNDS SHOULD BE DISTRIBUTED TO STATE UNIVERSITIES ON THE BASIS OF PLANNED TEACHER EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT AGENDAS WHICH:
-BUILD ON PROGRAM EVALUATIONS COMPLETED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND OTHERS
-ARE DEVELOPED BY THE UNIVERSITIES WITH THE PARTICIPATION OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS, COLLEGES OF EDUCATION AS WELL AS THE LEGISLATURE
-ADDRESS NEWLY ESTABLISHED INDICATORS OF QUALITY FOR STATE APPROVAL OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS
-REPRESENT A REDESIGN AND RECONCEPTUALIZATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

THE SYSTEM FOR FUNDING TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN FLORIDA SHOULD BE CHANGED. THE TASK FORCE SUPPORTS CURRENT EFFORTS TO MOVE TO A PROGRAM-BASED HIGHER EDUCATION FUNDING FORMULA WHICH IS LESS RELIANT ON ENROLLMENT LEVELS AND MORE RELIANT ON UNIVERSITY ACCOUNTABILITY. THE TASK FORCE RECOMMENDS THAT TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS BE AMONG THE FIRST PROGRAMS REVIEWED AND FUNDED UNDER THE NEW FORMULA. A REVISED SYSTEM SHOULD RESULT IN:
-ADEQUATE FUNDING OF THE CLINICAL COMPONENTS OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS INCLUDING A SPECIFIED MAXIMUM STUDENT-TEACHER RATIO OF 12:1
-A MORE COMPLETE INFORMATION BASE ON BOTH THE QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITATIVE INDICATORS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION IN FLORIDA
-A MORE ADEQUATE AND EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

4. Recognizing and Recruiting Talented Teachers

The fourth domain recognizes that the state must take coordinated and substantial action which focuses on the recruitment, retention, and recognition of talented teachers to Florida's classrooms. To counter society's poor image of the teaching profession as well as the low salaries offered to teachers, the Task Force developed recommendations calling for a public information campaign, a scholarship/loan program for teachers, incentives for business to make educational contributions, summer employment for teachers, higher salaries, a distinguished teacher certification category, and an innovative program aimed at recruiting academically talented college graduates into teaching.

Certification of Distinguished Teachers

A DISTINGUISHED TEACHER CERTIFICATION LEVEL SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED AND BASED ON THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:

THE CANDIDATE MUST HAVE AND DEMONSTRATE SUPERIOR KNOWLEDGE. THIS SHOULD INCLUDE BOTH KNOWLEDGE IN THE SUBJECT AREA(S) APPROPRIATE TO HIS OR HER CERTIFICATE AND KNOWLEDGE OF THE TEACHING/LEARNING PROCESS.

THE CANDIDATE MUST PERFORM IN A SUPERIOR FASHION IN THE CLASSROOM.

THE CANDIDATE SHOULD HAVE MADE POSITIVE CONTRIBUTIONS TO SCHOOLS AND THE TEACHING PROFESSION AND BE RECOMMENDED BY THE FACULTY. POSSIBLE PROCEDURES COULD INCLUDE EVALUATION BY A NEUTRAL BOARD OF A DOSSIER DOCUMENTING SUCH CONTRIBUTIONS PREPARED BY THE CANDIDATE AND COMMENTS ON THE APPROPRIATENESS OF THE CANDIDATE FOR DISTINGUISHED TEACHER STATUS SOLICITED BY THIS BOARD FROM CONCERNED PERSONS.

THE CERTIFICATE SHOULD HAVE A FIVE YEAR LIFE CYCLE. RENEWAL WOULD BE BASED ON DEMONSTRATION OF CRITERIA RELATED TO PERFORMANCE AND CONTRIBUTIONS TO SCHOOLS AND THE PROFESSION.

THE LEGISLATURE SHOULD AUTHORIZE THE EDUCATION STANDARDS COMMISSION, WITH K-12 TEACHERS AND TEACHER EDUCATION FACULTY, TO RECOMMEND SPECIFIC CRITERIA TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR APPROVAL OF THE ABOVE MENTIONED CATEGORIES. CRITERIA SHOULD BE DEVELOPED FOR BOTH INITIAL AND RENEWAL CERTIFICATES.

Public Information Campaign

GIVEN THE NEED FOR QUALITY TEACHERS AND THE NEED TO COUNTER MISPERCEPTIONS ABOUT TEACHER SURPLUS, IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION DEVELOP A PUBLIC INFORMATION CAMPAIGN TO HIGHLIGHT THE IMPORTANCE OF TEACHERS AND TEACHING TO FLORIDA'S EDUCATIONAL FUTURE, INFORM THE PUBLIC OF THE CHALLENGES AND REWARDS OF TEACHING, PROMOTE THE RECRUITMENT OF HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHER EDUCATION CANDIDATES INTO THE AREAS OF CRITICAL TEACHER SHORTAGE, AND PUBLICIZE THE AVAILABILITY OF TEACHER SCHOLARSHIP/LOANS.

THIS PUBLIC INFORMATION CAMPAIGN SHOULD CALL ATTENTION TO THE SUPERIOR PERFORMANCES OF TEACHERS PRESENTLY IN THE FIELD AND PROVIDE A STATEWIDE EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING AWARD TO THE OUTSTANDING INDIVIDUAL IN FLORIDA. THIS AWARD SHOULD BE GIVEN TO THAT TEACHER, SELECTED BY FACULTY, ADMINISTRATION, AND THE PUBLIC, WHO MOST REFLECTS THE DEDICATION AND EXCELLENCE REPRESENTATIVE OF QUALITY TEACHING PERFORMANCE. FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS SHOULD BE AWARDED TO THE STATE'S OUTSTANDING TEACHER, $2,000 TO EACH OF THE RUNNER-UPS, AND $1,000 TO EACH DISTRICT'S NOMINEE.

FUTURE TEACHERS OF AMERICA CLUBS SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED AND REDEVELOPED IN LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS TO PROVIDE SECONDARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOL STUDENTS WITH INFORMATION REGARDING THE CAREER OF TEACHING AND THE OPPORTUNITY TO PRACTICE WORKING WITH STUDENTS.

Scholarships/Loans

THE TASK FORCE RECOMMENDS THAT THE STATE ESTABLISH TWO SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMS TO BE IMPLEMENTED IN 1983, WHICH WOULD BOTH ATTRACT TALENTED YOUTH TO THE TEACHING PROFESSION AND ATTRACT STUDENTS INTO TEACHING CAREERS IN AREAS OF CRITICAL SHORTAGE. THE FIRST TYPE WOULD OFFER TWO HUNDRED HIGHLY COMPETITIVE SCHOLARSHIPS AT $4,000 PER YEAR TO PAY THE UPPER DIVISION COLLEGE COSTS OF PROSPECTIVE FLORIDA TEACHERS IN ANY STATE-APPROVED TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM. THE SECOND CATEGORY WOULD MAKE AVAILABLE FIVE HUNDRED SCHOLARSHIPS TO PAY FOR THE COSTS OF TUITION AND BOOKS FOR PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS, COMMENCING WITH THE FRESHMAN YEAR. IN THE SECOND PROGRAM, HOWEVER, THE TOTAL AWARD FOR TUITION AND BOOKS COULD NOT EXCEED THE COST OF ATTENDING A PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE OR STATE UNIVERSITY. SCHOLARSHIP RECIPIENTS WOULD BE ABLE TO REPAY THE AWARD AMOUNT EITHER BY TEACHING FULL TIME FOR ONE YEAR IN A FLORIDA PUBLIC SCHOOL FOR EACH YEAR THE SCHOLARSHIP IS GRANTED OR IN CASH IN SCHEDULED MONTHLY PAYMENTS AT THE CURRENT INTEREST RATE.

Business Tax Credits

THE STATE SHOULD AUTHORIZE PARTIAL BUSINESS TAX CREDITS TO PROMOTE THE INVOLVEMENT OF BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS FOR SUCH ACTIVITIES AS CONDUCTING TEACHER TRAINING WORKSHOPS AND TEACHING ADVANCED COURSES. HOWEVER, IN UTILIZING THESE CONTENT AREA SPECIALISTS AS ADJUNCT TEACHERS, PROVISIONS MUST BE MADE TO ENSURE THAT THESE INDIVIDUALS POSSESS ADEQUATE PEDAGOGICAL SKILLS.

Summer Employment

THE STATE LEGISLATURE SHOULD PROVIDE ADDITIONAL FUNDS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS FOR SUMMER EMPLOYMENT IN THE FORM OF EXTENDED CONTRACTS FOR TEACHERS IN MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE AND ALSO IN OTHER CRITICAL SHORTAGE AREAS. THESE OPPORTUNITIES SHOULD INCLUDE UPGRADING NECESSARY KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS, DEVELOPING CURRICULUM MATERIALS, CONDUCTING TEACHER TRAINING INSTITUTES, TEACHING SUMMER SCHOOL STUDENTS IN ENRICHMENT OR REMEDIAL PROGRAMS, WORKING IN BUSINESS/INDUSTRY, OR TAKING NECESSARY COURSEWORK TO ACQUIRE CERTIFICATION IN AREAS OF CRITICAL SHORTAGE.

Summer Institutes

THE STATE LEGISLATURE SHOULD PROVIDE FOR SUMMER INSTITUTES TO UPGRADE THE KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS OF CERTIFIED SCIENCE,

MATHEMATICS, AND OTHER TEACHERS IN CRITICAL SHORTAGE AREAS, AND ALSO TO RETRAIN CURRENT TEACHERS WHO ARE NOT CERTIFIED IN THESE AREAS. TEACHERS SELECTED TO PARTICIPATE SHOULD BE RECOMMENDED BY EACH SCHOOL DISTRICT BASED UPON NEED (INCLUDING SUCH FACTORS AS TEACHING OUT-OF-FIELD). FINANCIAL SUPPORT SHOULD COVER TUITION AND FEES, BOOKS, TRAVEL ALLOWANCES, FOOD, LODGING WHEN NECESSARY, AND A STIPEND. THE INSTITUTES SHOULD BE CAREFULLY MONITORED AND EVALUATED.

Salary Incentives

TEACHER SALARIES MUST BE INCREASED SIGNIFICANTLY TO MAKE TEACHING MORE COMPETITIVE WITH CAREERS IN PRIVATE INDUSTRY.

THE TASK FORCE SUPPORTS THE COMMITMENT IN THE STATE'S GOAL TO ACHIEVE THE UPPER QUARTILE IN TEACHER SALARIES BY 1985.

THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD EVALUATE PROGRESS TOWARD THAT GOAL ANNUALLY AND KEEP THE PUBLIC AND THE LEGISLATURE INFORMED OF THAT PROGRESS.

Magnet Program for Talented Teachers

THE STATE SHOULD ESTABLISH AN INNOVATIVE PROGRAM AIMED AT RECRUITING BRIGHT, TALENTED, COMMITTED BACCALAUREATE GRADUATES TO TEACH IN FLORIDA MIDDLE AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS, PARTICULARLY IN AREAS OF CRITICAL SHORTAGE. ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA MUST CAREFULLY BE DELINEATED, INCLUDING:

-A SCORE ON THE GRADUATE RECORD EXAMINATION IN AT LEAST THE SEVENTIETH PERCENTILE
-EVIDENCE THAT CANDIDATES MEET THE SUBJECT AREA SPECIALIZATION REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTIFICATION
-EVIDENCE OF A STRONG DESIRE AND CAPABILITY FOR WORKING WITH STUDENTS
-SATISFACTORY COMPLETION OF ONE COURSE IN SOCIAL ASPECTS OF EDUCATION AND ONE COURSE IN METHODS AND LEARNING THEORY
-SATISFACTORY COMPLETION OF AN INTENSIVE CLINICAL-BASED INTERN PROGRAM DEVELOPED COOPERATIVELY BETWEEN SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND UNIVERSITIES FOR WHICH THE CANDIDATE MAY RECEIVE COMPENSATION FROM A SCHOOL BOARD.

UPON COMPLETION OF THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA, THESE TEACHERS RECEIVE A TEMPORARY CERTIFICATE ENABLING THEM TO SERVE AS CLASSROOM TEACHERS FOR THREE YEARS IN FLORIDA PUBLIC SCHOOLS. THESE TEACHERS WOULD BE EXPECTED TO COMPLETE THE BEGINNING TEACHER PROGRAM. AFTER COMPLETING THE THREE YEAR REQUIREMENT, THESE INDIVIDUALS WOULD BE ENTITLED TO ONE YEAR OF TUITION-PAID COURSEWORK TOWARDS A MASTER'S DEGREE OF THEIR CHOICE.

5. Minority Teachers

The fifth area calls for increasing the support for the recruitment and training of prospective minority teachers. The Task Force was concerned that recent state testing policies are reducing opportunities

for minorities to be adequately represented in the teaching profession. Therefore recommendations include suggestions that the state fund a variety of programs aimed at strengthening the academic and test-taking skills of minorities, establishing a special scholarship program, and encouraging local school districts to use talented minority members of the private sector to serve as adjunct faculty.

Support for Prospective Minority Teachers

AS PART OF AN EFFORT TO ASSURE THAT QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS DO NOT DIMINISH THE INESTIMABLE VALUE OF DIVERSE FACULTIES, THE TASK FORCE RECOMMENDS THAT THE LEGISLATURE:
-APPROPRIATE FUNDS SUFFICIENT TO IMPLEMENT A PROGRAM FOR IMPROVING THE TEST TAKING SKILLS AND TEST AWARENESS OF MINORITIES AND THE ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED
-APPROPRIATE FUNDS FOR SCHOLARSHIPS TO ATTRACT ACADEMICALLY TALENTED AND HIGHLY MOTIVATED MINORITY AND ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS TO FULL-TIME TEACHING
-AUTHORIZE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A PROGRAM FOR ENCOURAGING MINORITIES WHO ARE MEMBERS OF PROFESSIONS OTHER THAN TEACHING TO SERVE IN THE SCHOOLS ON AN INTERMITTANT BASIS AS ADJUNCT FACULTY
-SUPPORT AND EXPAND THE EFFORTS OF FLORIDA A & M UNIVERSITY TO PREPARE STUDENTS FOR THE CLAST EXAMINATION, TEACHER CERTIFICATION EXAMINATION, AND OTHER STANDARDIZED TESTS IMPLEMENTED AS PART OF THE STATE'S QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (SIMILAR PROGRAMS SHOULD BE SUPPORTED AT OTHER INSTITUTIONS BY CONTRACTUAL AGREEMENT)
-SUPPORT ESTABLISHMENT OF SUMMER OUTREACH PROGRAMS AND RESEARCH EFFORTS WHICH ARE DESIGNED TO UPGRADE SKILLS AND THE ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS IN COMMUNICATION SKILLS, COMPUTATION SKILLS, AND GENERAL CULTURAL ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES.

6. Related Areas

Finally, the sixth domain pulls together a variety of recommendations aimed at improving those areas tangental to teacher preparation which were specified in the legislation and necessary ingredients in the overall effort to improve the quality of teachers. They include such factors as the workplace, salary and promotion, the role of the community colleges, the secondary school curriculum, and the impact of administrative leadership.

Analyzing the Workplace

SINCE IMPROVEMENTS IN THE WORKPLACE ARE CRITICAL TO THE RETENTION OF HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS, IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT A STUDY BE COMMISSIONED IMMEDIATELY TO EXAMINE THE WORKPLACE AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO WHY TEACHERS LEAVE THE CLASSROOM AFTER A FEW SHORT YEARS. FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED SHOULD INCLUDE PEER AND PUBLIC RECOGNITION, CLASSROOM CLIMATE, ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT, COMPENSATION, INVOLVEMENT IN THE DECISION-MAKING

PROCESS, THE ROLE OF INSERVICE EDUCATION, AND LACK OF CAREER LADDER.

Promotion and Salary Criteria for Teacher Education Faculty

COLLEGES OF EDUCATION AND UNIVERSITIES SHOULD BE STRONGLY ENCOURAGED BY THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION TO RECOGNIZE AND REWARD FACULTY WHO PROVIDE PROFESSIONAL PUBLIC SERVICE TO MEMBERS OF THE EDUCATIONAL COMMUNITY OF THE STATE. THE TASK FORCE BELIEVES IT IS EXTREMELY NECESSARY FOR THE HIGHER EDUCATION COMMUNITY TO UNDERSTAND THE VALUE OF THE SERVICES RENDERED BY COLLEGE OF EDUCATION FACULTY IN THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS OF THE STATE. TEACHING, RESEARCH AND SERVICE, ESPECIALLY SERVICE PROVIDED DIRECTLY TO THE SCHOOLS, SHOULD BE EQUALLY VALUED IN THE PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCESS.

Role and Scope of Community Colleges

COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD CONTINUE AND BE FURTHER ENCOURAGED TO PROVIDE A STRONG AND COHERENT TWO YEAR LOWER DIVISION UNDERGRADUATE LIBERAL ARTS AND/OR GENERAL EDUCATION FOR STUDENTS INTERESTED IN TRANSFERRING TO TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

COLLEGES OF EDUCATION SHOULD PROVIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE COUNSELORS WITH ATTRACTIVE, ACCURATE, AND TIMELY INFORMATION SO THAT STUDENTS CAN MAKE SOUND EDUCATIONAL AND CAREER DECISIONS. SUCH MATERIALS SHOULD INCLUDE INFORMATION ON JOB OPPORTUNITIES OR TRENDS, CHANGES IN CURRICULUM, AND A CLEAR STATEMENT OF THE KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND COMPETENCIES STUDENTS NEED TO BE WELL-PREPARED FOR TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

THE EDUCATION OF EFFECTIVE SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS TEACHERS IS PARTLY THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES WHICH OFFER THE LOWER DIVISION COURSES IN THESE AREAS. MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE FACULTY SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN APPROPRIATE IN-SERVICE EFFORTS.

THE ARTICULATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE SHOULD ESTABLISH A TASK FORCE OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM COMMUNITY COLLEGES, PUBLIC SCHOOLS, AND COLLEGES OF EDUCATION TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH INCLUDE:

-A REVIEW OF CERTIFICATION ISSUES AND PROBLEMS
-A DEFINITION OF THE ROLE AND SCOPE OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE INVOLVEMENT IN THE PRE-SERVICE AND IN-SERVICE TRAINING OF TEACHERS
-A REVIEW OF GENERAL EDUCATION AND SUBJECT MATTER OFFERINGS APPROPRIATE FOR PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS
-AN EXAMINATION OF THE FEASIBILITY AND TIMELINES OF SUPERVISED FIELD EXPERIENCES
-AN EXPLORATION OF FACULTY EXCHANGE OPPORTUNITIES BETWEEN COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND COLLEGES OF EDUCATION.

Secondary School Curriculum for Teacher Candidates

THE TASK FORCE ENDORSES THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS FOR COLLEGEBOUND STUDENTS AS SPECIFIED BY THE GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION ON SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND SUGGESTS THE FOLLOWING FOR THOSE INTERESTED IN PURSUING CAREERS IN TEACHING:

-FOUR YEARS OF ENGLISH
-FOUR YEARS OF MATHEMATICS, INCLUDING MICROCOMPUTER LITERACY IN THE NINTH GRADE
-FOUR YEARS OF SCIENCE
-THREE YEARS OF SOCIAL SCIENCE INCLUDING ONE YEAR EACH OF AMERICAN HISTORY AND WORLD HISTORY, AS WELL AS ONE SEMESTER EACH IN ECONOMICS AND AMERICAN GOVERNMENT
-ONE SEMESTER OF PRACTICAL ARTS
-ONE SEMESTER OF FINE ARTS
-ONE SEMESTER OF PERSONAL HEALTH
-ONE SEMESTER OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION
-TWO YEARS OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE.

Impact of Administrative Leadership

THE TASK FORCE ENDORSES CURRENT EFFORTS OF THE FLORIDA COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT TO UPGRADE AND IMPROVE THE IMPACT OF ADMINISTRATIVE LEADERS IN FLORIDA'S PUBLIC SCHOOLS, AND IN PARTICULAR SUPPORTS THE FOLLOWING:

-THE FLORIDA COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT SHOULD CONTINUE TO PROVIDE MANAGEMENT TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR PRINCIPALS.
-THE FLORIDA COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT SHOULD ASSESS THE QUALITY OF ALL LEVELS OF TRAINING (STATE, DISTRICT, UNIVERSITY) THROUGH WHICH PRINCIPALS WILL ACQUIRE THE VALIDATED COMPETENCIES.
-THE FLORIDA COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT SHOULD ENCOURAGE EFFECTIVE SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS AND UNIVERSITY FACULTY IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP PROGRAMS TO EVALUATE AND STRENGTHEN THEIR ADMINISTRATIVE TRAINING PROGRAMS IN LIGHT OF THE VALIDATED COMPETENCIES FOR PRINCIPALS AND THE DEVELOPING PROCESS OF COMPETENCY-BASED CERTIFICATION FOR ADMINISTRATORS.

Taken together, these recommendations represent a coordinated approach to improving the education of Florida's prospective teachers as well as helping ensure that the state's public schools hire only competent and qualified individuals to staff classrooms.

CHAPTER THREE

PERSONNEL NEEDS IN FLORIDA

With declining interest among college students in becoming teachers and rising enrollments in elementary schools, a general shortage of teachers has been predicted in the United States by the mid-1980s. The Task Force has examined a number of sources which describe an emerging critical shortage of teachers both in Florida and the nation. Of elemental value to the Task Force was the annual review of manpower studies regarding teaching personnel which the Education Standards Commission has prepared as required by statute. The Commission's June 1982 report provides a comprehensive data base for making accurate predictions about the supply and demand of teachers in Florida. The report's data included input from the Florida Association of School Personnel Administrators related to the demands for teachers for Florida schools and from the Florida Association of Colleges for Teacher Education on the projection of the supply of teachers currently in the state's teacher education programs. Selected data is tabulated in the table below ("Teachers for Florida," 1982)

Selected Areas of Critical Teacher Need for Florida

1980-81

Subject Area	Estimated Number of Vancancies	Number Passing FTCE from Florida*	Number of Florida Education Graduates** 1980-81	1982-83
Mathematics	708	85	95	102
Science	673	103	48	40
Speech Therapy	388	65	17	14
Industrial Arts	192	8	27	30
Emotionally Handicapped	636	34	134	132
Language Arts	963	227	211	189

*40 percent of the total who took the examination were graduates of Florida colleges and universities.

**Does not include graduates of colleges other than colleges of education.

In analyzing this data, the Education Standards Commission drew two basic conclusions:

First, Florida is rapidly approaching a period of shortage of teachers in many areas. At present, shortages exist in mathematics, science, and vocational education; shortages are approaching in foreign

languages, language arts, elementary education and exceptional student education.

Second, Florida school districts will need to recruit teachers more aggressively from outside the state (Florida's teacher education programs will graduate less than 40% of the new teachers hired in the state next year).

The reasons for the shortage are varied. Florida's enrollment in teacher education declined steadily in the late 1970s. Between 1975-1980, degrees in teacher education programs in Florida's colleges and universities decreased 24 percent. The Florida Teacher Certification Examination became a requirement for certification in 1980; the number of applicants for an initial certificate decreased from 20,943 in 1979-80 to 16,767 in 1980-81. This decrease in initial certification, however, cannot be attributed to the examination alone; state-mandated minimum admission requirements for entry into teacher education can also be identified as a factor. But even without more rigid program standards, individuals are reluctant to enter teaching because of the declining status of the profession, low salaries, a discouraging work place, and the poor image of teacher education programs.

If this trend continues, Florida, as well as the rest of the nation, will face severe areas of teacher shortages. The Task Force has addressed this critical situation by offering a number of recommendations aimed at the promotion, recruitment and recognition of teachers, while at the same time, augmenting quality standards for teachers entering the profession.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE CONCERN FOR QUALITY IN TEACHER EDUCATION

Though Americans have been expressing concern about the quality of public schools, there is ample evidence that they still believe that the strength, security, and prosperity of the nation are directly related to the quality of public schools. The 1982 Gallup Poll reveals that 84 percent selected "strong educational system" as the best guarantee of a strong America in the future; 66 percent selected "strong industrial system", and 47 percent selected "strong military". The poll showed that after medicine and science, the people have more confidence in education than their other institutions.

Accompanying this belief in the importance of education to society is a significant desire to improve the quality of education. Those who maintain that we need to improve our schools, their teachers, and the quality of the teachers' training usually cite: (1) the steady decline in students' college entrance scores over the past several years (1982 high school graduates were the first group in several years to show an increase in college entrance scores); (2) violence and drug use in the schools; (3) the presence of alcohol and other drugs in the schools; (4) the decline in the quality of students entering teacher training programs; (5) studies which indicate that a relatively higher proportion of our most able teachers are leaving the profession, while a relatively higher proportion of our less able teachers remain; (6) a severe shortage of qualified mathematics and science teachers and the prospect of an even greater shortage in the very near future and (7) the belief that teachers are being graduated without either adequate knowledge of the subjects they are to teach or the ability to manage the instructional process effectively.

Concerns about the strength and future vitality of the nation's economy lead directly to concerns about education at all levels, from the elementary school through our colleges and universities. There is widespread fear that our nation has fallen behind other advanced nations, especially West Germany and Japan, in mathematics, science, and technology. Our industries are as idle as they have been since the Great Depression because other nations have made better use than we have of technologies that we developed. Our failure to use what we have developed and to compete effectively is often blamed on our failure to maintain our educational standards and educational capabilities. There are charges that our people, young and old, have insufficient training in mathematics and in the social, biological, and physical sciences. Our secondary school students study less mathematics and science than do their counterparts in other highly industrialized nations. As we seem to fall behind other nations, the test scores of both our students and their teachers seem to decline. The Educational Testing Service reported last year that the average SAT composite scores of college-bound students who indicated that they planned to enter teacher education programs had dropped to the 36th percentile. It is difficult for the public to believe that the least able can effectively educate its most able students.

The expressions of concern about the quality of education are also expressions of a feeling of uneasiness and uncertainty that is shared by all economic and social classes. People read and hear about a new kind of society--a post-industrial society, an information society, a high-tech society--but are not sure what that means and how that will affect their lives. New knowledge and new applications of knowledge seem to grow faster than we can assimilate them while social and economic problems seem to grow in complexity and defy solution. There is a feeling that this knowledge base may be insufficient for their lives--from arithmetic to calculus, from nature study to theoretical physics and biological engineering. The feeling that social and economic problems are getting out of hand quite understandably causes people to raise questions about the quality of the schools, colleges, and universities that train their children's teachers.

The concerns of educational critics are not without foundation. At the end of World War II, the United States was the most powerful nation on the planet. It had achieved not only superior military and political power but also had the most powerful industrial system in the world. But by the beginning of the 1980s, most of its people were not working in industrial enterprises. Almost two-thirds were employed in the service or information industries, and only about 20 percent were working in traditional industries. These changes, which are often disruptive to the lives of people, are at least as great as those which accompanied our earlier transition from a rural-agrarian society to an urban-industrial society. However, this transition is occurring at a faster rate than that earlier transition--probably three or four times faster.

Somehow it seems that improved education will easily solve our many difficulties and clarify our uncertainties. Simple solutions are quickly offered: (1) provide adequate salaries for teachers and we will have better teachers who will quickly solve the problems; (2) require all secondary school teachers to earn a baccalaureate degree in a liberal arts college; (3) raise the standards for entry into the teaching profession; (4) eliminate present certification standards and let anyone with a bachelor's degree teach; (5) extend the length of teacher education programs to accommodate the increased need for both better pedagogical and better subject matter preparation. Unfortunately, there is no one simple way to improve the quality of our teachers, even though many of the proposals have considerable merit. Our society is in a period of great transition, and the nature of that transition requires not only the improvement of existing strategies but also the development of new strategies for schools, for teachers, and for teacher training.

If we are to meet the educational challenges of the emerging post-industrial society successfully, we will have to develop new and appropriate ways of meeting our educational needs. While developing new educational strategies and new educational programs for our students and for our teachers, we need to develop, to maintain, and continue to enforce statewide standards for the evaluation of all programs and all teachers. Our current standards should be viewed not as a goal to be achieved, but as a starting point. In developing and in improving

programs we need to recognize that both mastery of subject matter and the development of sound professional skills are necessary. There is no substitute for either. There is no question that good subject matter preparation is prerequisite to effective teaching. However, we must also recognize that studies have shown that inability to organize instruction adequately, inability to manage the classroom, and the lack of teaching skills are all more frequently cited as the cause of teacher failure than is the lack of subject matter knowledge. It is unlikely that raising teachers' salaries will attract many new mathematics and science teachers into our classrooms. Increasing the length of teacher training programs will do little if we simply do more of what we have been doing. The old answers will not work any better in education than they will work, as we are painfully learning, in business and industry. The new conditions that now face us require that we have more highly educated teachers and principals. Florida now has an excellent opportunity to move toward a creative resolution of these complex problems. We need funds earmarked to finance the efforts of several universities to make their teacher education programs responsive to the needs of our era.

To attract better qualified teachers, schools need to offer not only better salaries but better working conditions. Traditionally, schools could offer security and intrinsic rewards as an incentive for teaching. However, those are now in short supply and must be restored. During the recent period of fiscal austerity, many school districts have opted for quick solutions to financial troubles by cutting back on their teaching staffs. It is unlikely that talented students will invest their time and energy in a career in which financial rewards are not high and in which job security is precarious. We also need to make the school a more attractive place to work than it now is. The high incidence of violence in the schools, lack of discipline, and declining respect for teachers have all caused young adults to perceive the school as less than a desirable place to work. To retain good teachers, we need a work setting that allows our best teachers to exercise their intellectual and creative abilities. We need administrative leadership that recognizes, encourages, and rewards able and creative teachers.

While recruiting able students and retaining our best teachers are necessary, these actions alone are not sufficient to meet successfully the challenges that are before us. Teachers must be adequately prepared both in the subjects they are to teach and in the professional knowledge and skills they need for effective teaching. We need curricula that will prepare our teachers to enable our students to be productive members of our emerging post-industrial society and for the twenty-first century. Reducing professional courses is unlikely to help much.

While restructuring professional courses may help, it should be recognized that in our better teacher education programs, education majors preparing to teach in the secondary schools typically take only 18 to 24 semester hours in professional skills courses and from 92 to 98 semester hours in arts and science or other non-pedagogical departments, depending on their teaching field. They are required to earn as many, and sometimes more, hours in their subject field than are required of an arts and science major in the same subject area. Because most science

teaching positions require that the teacher be able to teach in more than one area of science (physics, chemistry, biology, earth science), science education students typically spread their science courses across two or more science areas, while the science major is required to concentrate on one area. This suggests that the science major will have greater depth in one area of science, while the science education major will have broader knowledge of the several areas of science covered in the typical secondary school curriculum. Because elementary teachers must teach every subject in the elementary program, they are even less able to concentrate in a single area of their subject matter preparation.

Some state governments have judged that teacher training for secondary school teachers could best be handled after completion of the baccalaureate degree. New Jersey, for example, adopted new state rules in 1982 which require all future teacher candidates graduating from state-approved teacher education programs to hold a major in an arts and science academic discipline rather than in teaching methodology. Their decision was based on the argument that strong teacher preparation programs must be built upon a solid foundation of liberal or general education and academic specialization (Johnson et al, 1981).

The most immediate and pressing questions are, how do we attract more qualified teachers into our schools, and how do we convince them to remain there? Obviously, better salaries will help. Recent editorials in Science (December 10, 1982; March 11, 1983) suggest that graduates from engineering programs now secure jobs that pay at least $20,000 a year. Those graduates are refusing to go on to graduate school because the benefits of further study do not outweigh the short-term salary loss. Yet the schools have even less to offer to graduates with degrees in mathematics or science. In Miami, for example, beginning teachers earn $14,299; in Tampa, $13,000; in Pensacola, $11,654; and in Orlando, $12,500. In 1981-82, the national average salary of teachers was $19,061, while Florida teachers averaged $16,907. According to USA Today (1982), a Texas school district found that high school graduates in the first year after graduation averaged $4,800 more than beginning teachers employed by the district. Salary ranges for teachers compared with those of other professions are dismal; in 1980-81, the average teacher earned, $17,364, while accountants averaged $24,215; chemists, $35,983; and engineers, $31,820.

Educators such as Robert Howsam, B.O. Smith, Dale Scannell, George Denemark, David Imig, Donald Medley, and many others, suggest that the majority of contemporary teacher education programs have changed little from the initial collegiate model developed in the 1930s. They would agree that a strong liberal arts foundation is indispensable for the development of adequate professional skills. They argue that strong pedagogical scholarship is what distinguishes those who are well educated from those who are both well educated and also understand the complex and artful skill of teaching. They argue that current programs have not provided enough of the "right type" of pedagogical training, that although pedagogical knowledge has been enriched dramatically over the years, constraints placed upon practice have not allowed us to use it effectively. During this period of change, schools have been

assigned new roles with attendant responsibilities for teachers; society has become markedly more complex and demanding and the research and theory on learning and schooling has expanded greatly.

The demands on teachers and the public schools have expanded significantly since the turn of the century and dramatically since the end of World War II. At the end of the 19th century, waves of uneducated immigrants, the shift from a rural to urban social context, and the emergence of industrialization and bureaucracies demanded that the nation's public schools "Americanize" the population, particularly immigrant youth, to prepare all youth to enter an industrial society and to help future citizens to adjust to modern pressures.

Since World War II, the public schools have assumed more responsibility for more people than ever before. Before World War II and before the Great Depression, many children left school at age 14 or age 16 to enter the labor force. After World War II, however, the requirements of the marketplace changed significantly. The marketplace required that entrants have the skill level and the social development of high school graduates. Moreover, the public schools acquired the added responsibilities of training the manpower America needed for entry into the atomic and electronic age. They were also assigned the responsibility for extending and equalizing opportunities for the poor, women, and racial and ethnic minorities, for providing access to handicapped students, and for preparing citizens to participate productively in the post-industrial society. While there has been a demand for more and better academic preparation of our students, there has been a parallel need for better instruction in relatively new areas: economic or consumer education, parent education, career education, drug education, environmental education, bilingual and multicultural education. At some point, we need to revise our curricula and stop adding disconnected pieces.

Even our view of the student has changed. The range of experiences and the range of settings from which our students come to us is greater than ever before. The incidence of non-maternal care of children has increased significantly since World War II, and every indication is that it will continue to increase. Post World War II court decisions and the development of a children's rights movement are forcing us to redefine the nature of the relationship that exists between students and teachers.

A knowledge explosion has taken place, requiring future citizens to have more information, particularly in the areas of mathematics and science. The technological age has opened up vast areas of knowledge in the hard and social sciences. Growing global social, political, and economic interdependence has created a need for knowledge about other cultures and of other languages. Television and other media sources provide a need for vast amounts of knowledge related to a wide range of social, political, and aesthetic issues at a variety of societal levels. The threat of nuclear annihilation and economic self-destruction requires knowledgeable citizens to make competent decisions based on critical analysis rather than pure emotion and self-interest. The increase in knowledge necessary for responsible citizenship in an

American democratic society will require teachers with higher levels of academic knowledge and teaching skills.

The research on effective teaching shows that there exists a broad and substantial knowledge base in the various teaching fields that has increased rapidly in recent years. This point is given breadth if we consider just some of the following findings of research on teacher effectiveness. One researcher reports that teacher influence in many circumstances may account for 20 percent or more of the variance in pupil achievement. Recent studies by a number of researchers indicate that specific teacher behavior in the classroom, combined with appropriate instructional content and classroom climate, are highly instrumental in promoting some types of learning as well as classroom order. A number of researchers have found that effective teacher behavior varies according to the subject being taught, and according to such pupil characteristics as age and socioeconomic status. Researchers have helped us better understand the problem of "classroom management" and "presentation of content" and have developed principles for predicting the consequences of behaviors and identifying and developing significant missing behaviors. These basic principles and specific skills can be taught to teachers. This brief review suggests that the knowledge base on effective teaching is substantial and that this knowledge has positive implications for improvement of Florida's teachers and teacher education programs.

These three factors combined provide compelling reasons for the nation's state governments to initiate more dynamic, creative, professional, and rigorous solutions to improving their teacher preparation programs.

State Policy and Teacher Education Reform

Despite this growing complexity of American society, these demands on public schools, and an increased understanding of what constitutes effective teaching, states have not chosen to mandate that teacher education programs be reconceptualized or redesigned. Nor have they been inclined to encourage approved programs to extend the length of their curriculum to five years, although such plans are under consideration in Oregon and Washington. Instead, most states have chosen the strategy of requiring higher standards for teachers to become certified, higher academic standards for students to gain admission to teacher education programs, and more rigorous standards for approval of teacher education programs.

As of 1982, thirty-five states already had or were then considering competency testing for teachers; sixteen states, including Florida, were on record with fully developed testing devices. Several states, including Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, Maryland, and Oklahoma, had implemented entry year internships and beginning teacher programs before granting a teaching certificate. Other states, such as New York, Nebraska, and Hawaii, initially grant only provisional certificates; permanent certification requires a few years of teaching experience and, in the case of New York, a master's degree.

Several states have strengthened program admission standards as a measure to reform teacher education. More rigid admission standards are generally implemented through a variety of nationally validated or state-developed tests which measure the basic skills. Connecticut, Maryland, and Kansas are three states which are adopting higher admission measures to assure teacher quality (Scanlon et al, 1982).

New Jersey provides an example of a state that has imposed more rigorous program approval standards to promote quality control. In 1981, more stringent standards for program approval were imposed on New Jersey's teaching training institutions including such areas as academic specialization, preadmission field experience requirements, and the qualifications of faculty (Johnson et al, 1981).

When examining the changes which have been made in teacher education policies in the past decade, the Sunbelt states are often cited as leaders in this effort. For example, the May 1982 "Report of the Council of Chief State School Officers Ad Hoc Committee on Teacher Certification, Preparation, and Accreditation" indicates that the southern states have been innovators in teacher education by implementing such measures as setting cut-off scores in tests of basic skills for entry into teacher education and using basic skills and professional skills tests for initial certification (Scanlon et al, 1982). Georgia, Florida, Oklahoma, and South Carolina are frequently cited in the literature. Strengthened standards have also been attributed partly to the efforts of the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) to improve the quality of higher education.

Recent State Policy Changes in Florida

Florida has been a leader in efforts aimed at strengthening teacher competence by instituting several major changes in certification procedures.

(a) Florida Teacher Certification Examination

Through a comprehensive written examination, candidates for the Florida teacher certificate must now demonstrate mastery of the essential competencies that have been adopted in Florida State Board Rules (Section 231.17, Florida Statutes). The Florida Teacher Certification Examination, which was implemented in July, 1980, consists of four subtests: writing, reading, mathematics, and professional education. The entire examination takes approximately five hours to complete. Statistical data on approximately 16,000 candidates who took the examination after August 1981 indicate that the average percentage of candidates passing each subtest was: writing, 92 percent; mathematics, 87 percent; reading, 90 percent; and professional education, 94 percent. The overall passing rate was 83 percent. These results suggest that in general, individual performance on the examination was high and that the state has large numbers of academically talented prospective teachers entering the profession. Because so many people successfully pass the examination concern must be raised about the level of difficulty found in the examination. A more

extensive discussion of this problem appears in Section II-A, Chapter 5 of this report.

(b) Minimum Admission Standards and 80 Percent Rule

In Section 240.529, Florida Statutes, the state enacted two quality control measures to increase the competence of teachers. First, each state-approved teacher education program whether public or private, must require as a prerequisite for admission that a student receive a score at the 40th percentile or higher on the SAT/ACT. Second, effective July 1982, 80 percent of the applicants for certification of any Florida approved teacher education program must pass the Florida Teacher Certification Examination in order for that program to maintain state approval.

(c) Beginning Teacher Program

As of July 1982, all candidates for a teaching certificate in Florida must also satisfactorily complete a year-long Beginning Teacher Program or have completed three years of satisfactory out of state teaching. The primary purpose of the Beginning Teacher Program is to improve the performance of all first year teachers through a comprehensive program of support, training, and documentation of the generic teaching competencies. A school district conducts the program during an individual's initial year of employment in which the participant receives full pay. According to Section 231.17, Florida Statutes, successful completion of the Beginning Teacher Program means that the superintendent has verified that the beginning teacher has completed the program successfully.

In order to verify the demonstration of the generic teaching competencies through formative and summative evaluation processes, a performance measurement system has been developed by a coalition of representatives from Florida School districts and universities. The measurement system provides standardized procedures for conducting observation and performance evaluation of beginning teachers to ensure consistency within the state.

Clearly, these policy changes have done much to direct the state toward improving the quality of teachers who reach the state's classrooms. Indeed, they represent a forceful and impressive beginning. Much, however, remains to be accomplished. An analysis of the content and organizational structure of Florida's teacher education programs provides the basis for a better understanding of these needs.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN FLORIDA

General Framework

Several general points must be made to clarify the direct and indirect influences shaping the organizational structure of teacher education programs. Unlike other professions, the content and process of teacher education is subject to direct public scrutiny, debate, and sometimes modification. How and what teachers are taught remains intimately tied to the public's shifting demands upon school content and changing conceptions of its societal purpose. Consequently, during recurrent periods of reassessment and accountability, not only are the competencies of specific teachers called into question, but the practices of their educational institutions have been challenged as well.

Although public influence has certainly tempered the present character of teacher education, the major forces of organizational change and professionalization of teacher education have come from the influence of professional educators, the directives of legislative statutes, and conformity to state board rules. Since teacher training emerged from the normal school training format, adaptation within the four-year baccalaureate institution has meant both conflict and compromise over allocation of time and resources to the various areas of study deemed necessary for the professional education of prospective teachers.

Yet surprisingly, in Florida as elsewhere, a fairly consistent organizational framework for teacher preparation has developed over time. These programs are characterized by four distinct components of subject area preparation: (1) general education; (2) preprofessional study in the disciplines which address pedagogical theory and practice; (3) academic specialization; and (4) professional study (specific and general) including clinical application and practice.

General education represents the diversity of coursework in lower division liberal arts studies which provide the prospective teacher with a broad based educational framework on which to build proficiency and substantive content in specialized areas.

Preprofessional studies represent coursework in the social and behavioral sciences which are the basis for understanding the theoretical and conceptual bases of learning processes, school culture, and the school as an institution in society. Insights from these studies facilitate student understanding of the varied context of various schools and communities. Unfortunately for a state as pluralistic as Florida, few preprofessional courses are offered in conventional teacher education programs.

Academic specialization includes the study of subject matter in which the teacher candidate will later specialize (e.g., mathematics, English, music, etc.). Coursework covered during this period should be of sufficient scope and rigor to ensure mastery of that particular academic subject. Proficiency in this content area is necessary for teachers to be able to challenge students in schools and to prepare new teachers for accurate and confident practice in the classroom. For programs of elementary and exceptional student education, the character of academic specialization courses includes an integrated blend of applied content studies to specific age, grade, or learning situations.

Professional studies include two pedagogical areas which support one another. The first includes those courses which focus on what is known about learning in general, e.g., tests and measurement theory, cognitive domain, etc. The second addresses pedagogical knowledge and skills related to teaching specific subjects or content areas or to teaching a particular age or grade, cultural or linguistic backgrounds, or working with learners with particular physical or mental abilities.

Also included in this area of professional studies are the clinical and field components of pedagogical practice, in which prospective teachers have the opportunity to apply theory and knowledge in a classroom context. This component is often integrated into the student's professional preparation sequence early, but there is variation among programs in the frequency, duration, and supervision of such opportunities.

Colleges and universities in Florida that offer teacher education programs use a variety of interpretations and applications in translating these components into practice. This results from variations in the availability and internal distribution of university resources, the institutional relationships within college/university programs and to the respective communities as well as the particular philosophical emphasis which different programs place on differing components. This has led to substantial diversity in the ways in which teacher education programs are structured and how they emphasize those four organizational components.

Course Catalogue Survey

A catalogue survey of coursework required by state universities and colleges for professional preparation was compiled to examine similarities and variations among Florida's teacher education programs and to determine the degree to which they conform to and/or exceed state certification coursework requirements and national professional association standards (e.g., National Council of Teachers of Mathematics).

Course catalogues were examined from institutions specifically selected to highlight the range of enrollment size and program comprehensiveness which presently service Florida's educational needs. Institutions that differ in physical and capital resources, faculty size, student enrollments, public or private status vary with regard to the numbers and types of teacher preparation programs offered and, to

some extent, with regard to the coursework required for a student to fulfill institutional program requirements. The focus of the survey was to determine how possible variations among programs and schools interface with state certification mandates and national recommendations.

The nine institutions selected ranged in size and comprehensiveness from large (University of Florida, Florida State University, University of South Florida, University of Miami) to midsized institutions (Florida International University, University of West Florida, Jacksonville University, Stetson University) to smaller, more program-specific colleges (Flagler, Barry).

In general, teacher education programs in these and other institutions fall into three broad domains: elementary education, secondary education, and exceptional student education. Within the generic area of elementary education, several specific programs and specializations may be offered: early childhood education, elementary 1-6, elementary science, etc. For secondary education, specific programs may include: mathematics, English/language arts, science, etc. Presently exceptional student education subsumes nine specialty areas leading to certification: emotional disturbances, mental retardation, specific learning disabilities, occupational therapy, speech and audiology, gifted, and motor and visual disabilities.

Not all of the institutions examined offer programs in these three general areas, nor are they certain to offer all specialty programs within these areas if they do touch upon all three generic domains. For example, music education may not be offered in secondary education programs. Finally, colleges/schools/departments of education often offer various other education-related programs, such as counseling, health education, and recreational/leisure services that were excluded from this examination since they do not apply directly to teacher education.

A strong relationship often exists between the structure of program coursework and state certification requirements. Two methods exist in Florida for certification of prospective teachers. One method, the "credentialing approach," analyzes the university transcripts of individual teacher candidates against a set of predetermined state course and experience requirements. The second method, the "approved program approach", sanctions and approves the teacher education program and institution from which a student graduates. This approval process guarantees that institutions provide students with those courses that conform to state minimum standards. (See page 65 for a more complete description of the program approval process.) The degree to which approved and non-approved program coursework complies with/or exceeds state requirements subsequently becomes an issue of interest in this catalogue review.

This examination was also interested in comparing the coursework profile of secondary-level subject area specialists in education (e.g., mathematics education) with their student counterparts from programs in

arts and sciences to determine equivalence in subject area preparation existed between the two groups.

General Survey Results

The survey paid special attention to secondary and elementary education programs. Institutional program offerings in exceptional student education were not examined extensively due to the diversity of specialization areas for certification.

Several caveats apply to the following analysis and interpretation of catalogue information. First, had time permitted, teacher education offices from individual programs would have been consulted in order to gather this information more precisely. Unfortunately, time did not allow extensive personal contact. Second, catalogues vary in clarity, coherence, and specificity. The Task Force wishes to apologize for errors which may have been made in this examination due to inability to understand or accurately represent course requirements for a particular teacher education program on the basis of the catalogue alone.

(1) Secondary Education The results of the secondary education program review can be found in Table 1 (page 39), which details the number of coursework hours required by the nine institutions for English, science, and mathematics education majors in the following component areas: general education, professional preparation, academic specialization, and clinical/field experience. Credit hours allocated to various courses in professional preparation are displayed followed by a notation (F) indicating whether or not each particular course conforms to Florida certification requirements.

The results indicate little consensus regarding the number of hours necessary for professional preparation. The number of credit hours offered in this area ranged from 18 to 30 hours. All institutions comply, however, with the minimum state certification requirements; several require supplementary professional coursework in areas such as human relations, special education, media methods, and methods for particular subject specialization.

The extent of clinical experience offered to these education majors varies from zero to six credit hours. It was often difficult to tell from course descriptions whether particular methods courses included a clinical component. Judging from the response to the Task Force program chairperson's survey on a similar question concerning the amount of clinical and early field experience to which secondary education students are exposed, it appears that catalogue course descriptions may understate the amount of clinical preparation available to students. In general, however, it does not appear that clinical experience is placed at the center of pedagogical training. Clinical observation and practice seem not to provide the theoretical or organizational framework around which the rest of professional preparation is built. This small sample would suggest that professional preparation is still primarily a didactic rather than a clinical or laboratory mode of preparation.

The majority of secondary programs allow and require lower division coursework as partial fulfillment of the academic specialization component-varying from zero to 12 credit hours. However, this does not preclude also requiring students to take a substantial number of upper division courses in their academic specialization to complete programs (e.g., a range of 21-33 upper division hours in secondary English). Also, each of these programs appears to be structured to allow students to utilize elective hours to strengthen their speciality-area proficiency further, if they so desire.

A key question in the debate over the present quality of teacher education addresses this level of subject area mastery for secondary education majors. It has been suggested that these prospective teachers receive content area training which is potentially less extensive and/or rigorous than is received by their liberal arts counterparts. A breakdown of content area coursework for both education and arts and science majors in mathematics, English and science for these nine institutions is displayed in Tables 1A, 1B, and 1C (see pages 40-41). Total numbers of credit hours required as well as the relative distribution of upper and lower division courses permitted for program completion are illustrated.

The distribution of lower and upper division courses for education and non-education majors seems very similar within any particular institution. It is the variation in the number of courses which different institutions consider necessary for subject area proficiency that appears to be of significance here. In English education, for example, variations in program course requirements between universities/colleges (from 24 to 42) are far greater than the variation within institutions across the education/arts and science division (e.g., 33 hours for education majors, 27 hours for non-education majors at University of Florida). Also, the common claim that education majors receive less rigorous academic area coursework (measured in terms of the relative distribution of upper and lower division courses) than do their non-education major counterparts does not appear to be the case. A comparison of education/non-education major coursework load at Florida A & M University on Table 1B and the University of South Florida on Table 1C reflects these points.

This congruence between secondary education programs and their counterparts in arts and sciences reflects patterns of communication and articulation across departments. However, while programs require coursework in subject matter clearly above and beyond minimum state certification requirements, there appears to be no consensus among institutions concerning the nature and extent of course preparation for subject area mastery.

What generalizations then, can be made about the qualitative nature of subject area preparation for education and non-education majors?

First, it is apparent that subject matter requirements in secondary education exceed state requirements. There are no instances in areas either in mathematics or science where programs fall below state

requirements; indeed most exceed them by requiring a heavier concentration of upper division courses. (Those programs in the area of English that appear to fall below the state's 30 hour requirement --Florida State University, the University of Miami and Jacksonville University - in practice exceed these requirements when appropriate general education courses in English and speech are included in the lower division tabulations.) In general, students proceeding through these programs seem to be more than adequately prepared in areas of academic specialization according to standards determined by minimum state certification requirements. Yet due to the nature of the minimum state level requirements (e.g., completion of a bachelor's degree with major in biology or a bachelor's degree with at least 20 semester hours in biological science) a student may be able to acquire secondary science certification by completing 20 credit hours of introductory level science courses. In this situation, a teacher candidate, once having completed professional preparation requirements, may acquire a variety of additional certificates without ever having to comply with specific institutional program requirements. Under these circumstances certified teachers may not be adequately trained in subject matter knowledge and practices.

The second consideration concerns the nature of coursework within specific program requirements. Mathematics education majors and pure mathematics majors may often take qualitatively different kinds of courses even though they take roughly the same number of upper and lower division courses. Mathematics majors, for example, may take 12 credits of advanced calculus while the mathematics education major takes 12 upper division credits in algebra or college geometry.

Also, one could argue that liberal arts and sciences majors may be better prepared in subject matter due to their ability to take elective courses in their content area or, perhaps as important, courses in related areas. An English major studying ninteenth century romantic poetry, for example, might increase his/her understanding of this subject by simultaneously taking a history course in eighteenth century British history. Such an opportunity does not always exist for the education major who has other, more pressing claims on available elective time. However, the trade-off between pedagogy and subject matter that may potentially limit secondary education majors does not mean that these individuals fail to practice satisfactorily in the classroom. In fact, they are more likely to be better prepared to teach because of the instructional and classroom strategies they learned through the professional preparation component of secondary education programs. One must keep in mind that it is difficult to determine from a cursory catalogue review the extent to which secondary education majors actually choose to use electives to supplement their knowledge of a subject area. This would require a detailed comparison of individual student transcripts. Certainly, the catalogues suggest that secondary education majors do have the potential to take rigorous subject matter related electives. But their choices are limited compared to the options of liberal arts and sciences majors. The question becomes whether the requisites for excellence in subject matter as exhibited by liberal arts and sciences majors should come at the expense of the

development of skills in pedagogy as exhibited by secondary education majors.

An analysis was made of education and non-education majors in mathematics at five institutions to assess these institutions' compliance with the standards for coursework requirements for secondary school teachers of mathematics as determined by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics to be necessary to ensure excellence in practice (see Table 2, page 41). Results suggest that at all institutions examined, the nationally recommended courses are either required or offered for education students with the exception of one course category ("advanced math in the subject area"). Also prospective mathematics teachers are required to take more of the recommended courses than their liberal arts counterparts. In general, it appears that by national standards, mathematics education programs at these five institutions embody the necessary elements for proficiency and competence in professional practice.

Further information about variation in individual institutional coursework would require greater in-depth analysis of actual program practice and course content. These preliminary examinations have highlighted the basic organizational structure of secondary education teacher preparation in some of Florida's institutions, in hope of providing a basic understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of program components as they presently exist and of their relationship to state certification requirements.

(2) Elementary Education. Due to the subject area diversity inherent in the character of elementary education, methods courses designed to prepare prospective teachers absorb a great deal of both professional preparation and academic specialization time and resources. Both individual programs and state certification requirements see methods courses in mathematics, science, language arts, social studies, art and music, and health as necessary for elementary teachers to be effective in the classroom. Subject matter is often an integral part of these courses, particularly in mathematics, but it is often less emphasized than for instruction in pedagogical strategies. It has been argued that this situation leaves the student with only a general subject knowledge. Of the programs examined, only one, Florida A & M University, requires a sizeable number of background courses in those academic specialization areas which constitute the elementary specializations (art, music, social studies, etc.) Five institutions offer additional specialization area courses in mathematics. These courses are not required by either program or state. There were no additional course offerings in science among the programs examined (See Table 3, page 42).

Elementary programs in general appear to be structured so as to allow limited elective credit options. Analysis of the survey suggests that a majority of these hours are ordinarily used up in meeting the prerequisite criteria for program requirements. In many cases, it is difficult to determine how these professional preparation courses are "blocked" or sequenced within the general developmental and orga-

nizational framework of elementary teacher preparation. Assessment of such programmatic qualities as course integration, coherence, and articulation within the total program of studies must be left for more comprehensive individual institutional examination, if so desired.

(3) Exceptional Student Education. Descriptive comparisons of these programs among institutions were virtually impossible on the basis of the catalogue examination due to the large number of exceptional student education areas. Cursory examination of a random selection of universities offering these programs suggests that the majority of programs exceed state certification requirements. Several programs have been extended to require completion of the master's degree as an institutional program requirement and others are moving in this direction. In general, student preparation in these areas appears to be rigorous, well integrated, and closely monitored.

It should be noted that the catalogues examined are structured in such a way as to force the information seeker constantly to flip back and forth among sections in order to determine program requirements and course content. Such arrangements are confusing and may mislead prospective students by not allowing them to make an adequate assessment of program strengths and weaknesses as they relate to their particular interests.

TABLE 1

SECONDARY EDUCATION

Institution			U.F.		F.S.U.		F.A.M.U.		U.S.F.		Barry		Flagler		U.W.F.		Miami		Jackson. Univ.	
Total Degree/Gen Ed. S.H.			125	45	120	46	120	51	120	40	120	45	120	30	120	36④	120	24-45	120	36
		Courses	Hrs	Cert	Hrs	Cert	Hrs	Cert	Hrs	Cert	Hrs	Cert	Hrs	Cert	Hrs	Cert	Hrs	Cert	Hrs	Cert
Professional Preparation		Ed. Psych	3	F	3	F	3	F	3	F	3*	F	3*	F	4	F	3*	F	3	F
		Soc. Foundations	3	F	3	F	3	F	3	F	3*	F	3*	F	4	F	3*	F	3	F
		Methods	9	F	11	F	18	F	14	F	10	F	13	F	12	F	12	F	15-18	F
		Clinical			5		3						6		6				6	
		Special Ed.							3											
		Human Relations			3								3							
		Electives	1-3																	
		Media Ed.					3													
		Psychology					3*													
		Totals	18		25		22		23		21		25		27		18		27-30	
Student Teaching Hrs			11	F	12	F	12	F	10	F	9	F	12	F	10	F	9	F	12	F
Academic Specialization	Lower	English	12		0		3		0		12		6		15⑤		12		0	
		Math	0		0		8		0		12		6		15		11		0	
		Science	22		0		6		0		6		6		15		15		8	
	Upper	English	21	A	24	A	33①	A	42	A	18	A	27	A	18	A	12		30	A
		Math	30-31②	A	31	A	39	A	32	A	18	A	27		18	A	18	A	24	A
		Science	27	A	—	A	26		45	A	30	A	27		18		17	A	28	A
Electives		English	18		13						12-18		14		14		3-24		0-9	
		Math	21		10	①	6		(var)		18				14		3-24		0-9	
		Science	2						(var)		21-30				14		16		0-12	

* - lower division courses
F - meets Florida state certification requirements
A- state approved program
var - variable amount of credit hours
① - minimum 27 hrs. of English courses. Total 33 credits includes 6 hrs. of lower division speech.
② - total 30-31 hrs. includes 3 credit hours of electives in upper division math
③ - These 10 elective credit hours should constitute a specialization area.
④ - transfer with a minimum of 60 hrs., 36 of which are general education
⑤ - transfer specialization courses, half of which may be at the lower division level, are appropriate.

TABLE 1A SECONDARY EDUCATION - ENGLISH

English Education/ English	state certification requirements	U.F.	F.S.U.	F.A.M.U.	U.S.F.	Barry	Flagler	U.W.F.	U. of Miami	Jacksonville U.
1. College of Education Major										
1-A) **total** # of credit hours required ② in subject area specialization	30	33	24	36	42-44	30	33	33	24	30
B) total # of lower division credit hours permitted to fulfill (A)	15	14	0	3	0	12	6	0	12	0
C) total # of upper division credit hours permitted to fulfill (A)	12	19	24	33	42-44	18	27	33	12	30
D) total # of related subject matter credit hours to fulfill or supplement (A)	6	6				10-15	6	var	20-35	0
2. Arts and Sciences Major										
2-A) **total** # of credit hours required for major specialization	N/A	27	33	36	40	30	33	33	24	30
B) total # of lower division credit hours permitted to fulfill (A)	N/A	8	9	0	0	12	6	0	12	0
C) total # of upper division credit hours permitted to fulfill (A)	N/A	19	24	36	40	18	27	33	12	30
D) electives credit hours permitted to fulfill or supplement (A)①	N/A	12①			16	12-15	6	var	20-35	0

var - variable amount of credit hours
N/A - not applicable
① - may be either upper or lower division (included in 27 hours)
② - not including general education requirements

TABLE 1B SECONDARY EDUCATION - SCIENCE

Science Education (biology)/ Science (biology)	state certification requirements	U.F.	F.S.U.	F.A.M.U.	U.S.F.	Barry	Flagler	U.W.F.	U. of Miami	Jacksonville U.
1. College of Education Major										
1-A) **total** # of credit hours required in subject area specialization	20	45-52	50	32	40	36	33	32	32	52
B) total # of lower division credit hours permitted to fulfill (A)	var	19-21	8	6	8	6	6	0	15	8
C) total # of upper division credit hours permitted to fulfill (A)	var	23-27	36	26	32	30	27	32	17	28
D) total # of related subject matter credit hours to fulfill or supplement (A)	var	4	14	18	16		6		20-35	16
2. Arts and Sciences Major										
2-A) **total** # of credit hours required for major specialization①	N/A	39	51	26	40	36	33	38	32	52
B) total # of lower division credit hours permitted to fulfill (A)	N/A	19	13	13	8	6	6	0	15	28
C) total # of upper division credit hours permitted to fulfill (A)	N/A	20	23	13	32	30	27	38	17	8
D) electives credit hours permitted to fulfill or supplement (A)①	N/A	16	15	21			6		18-21	16

var - variable amount of credit hours
① - includes **only** courses related to biology. Most schools require one year of organic chemistry, physics and calculus in addition to the total number of courses required for a major in biology.

TABLE 1C SECONDARY EDUCATION - MATHEMATICS

Mathematics Education / Mathematics	state certification requirements	U.F.	F.S.U.	F.A.M.U.	U.S.F.	Barry	Flagler	U.W.F.	U. of Miami	Jacksonville U.
1. College of Education Major										
1-A) **total #** of credit hours required① in subject area specialization	21	30-31	31	47	32	30	33	24	29	24
B) total # of lower division credit hours permitted to fulfill (A)	var	0	0	8	0	12	6	0	11	0
C) total # of upper division credit hours permitted to fulfill (A)	var	30-31	31	39	32	18	27	24	18	24
D) total # of related subject matter credit hours to fulfill or supplement (A)	0	0				12-15	6	9	20-35	0
2. Arts and Sciences Major										
2-A) **total #** of credit hours required for major specialization	N/A	33-34	42	44-49	38	30	33	27	29	24
B) total # of lower division credit hours permitted to fulfill (A)	N/A	0	6	8	0	12	6	0	11	0
C) total # of upper division credit hours permitted to fulfill (A)	N/A	33-34	36	36-41	38	18	27	27	18	24
D) electives credit hours permitted to fulfill or supplement (A)①	N/A				15-20	12-15	6	9	20-35	0

var - variable amount of credit hours
① - a bachelor's or higher degree with 21 credits in math including calculus

TABLE 2 COURSE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACADEMIC SPECIALIZATION IN MATHEMATICS

	U.F.		U.S.F.		U.W.F.		BARRY		MIAMI	
(National Council of Teachers of Mathematics)	teacher ed	liberal arts	teacher ed.	liberal arts	teacher ed	liberal arts	teacher ed.	liberal arts	teacher ed.	liberal arts
calculus (1, 2, 3, courses recommended)	R 1, 2	R 1, 2, 3	R 1, 2, 3	R 1, 2, 3	R 1,	R 1, 2	R 1, 2, 3	R 1, 2, 3	R 1, 2, 3	R 1, 2, 3, 4
computer (high level language)	R	R	0①	0			②	②	0	0
linear algebra	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R	R
abstract algebra	R	R	R	R	R	R			R	R
geometry	R	R	R	R	R	0	R	0	0	0
probability/statistics	R	R	R	R	R	0	R	R	R	0
mathematics modeling and applications	0	0			0	0			0	R
mathematics for the subject area (advanced, related to the school curriculum)									R①	
history of mathematics	0	0					R	0		
(at least one of the following)										
differential equations①	R	R	R	R	R				R	R
number theory①	2,	1,	2,	2,	2,				1,	1, 2
combinatorial analysis①										
graph theory①	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
logic and foundations①	3, 5	3, 5	1,	1,	1,	1,	1,	1,	3, 7	3, 7
mathematics programming①										
applied mathematics②										
method for the subject area	R		R		R		R		R	

R - required course
0 - course is offered
① - use in classroom offered
② - available in the computer science program
③ - in geometry

TABLE 3

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

Institution		U.F.		F.S.U.		F.A.M.U.		U.S.F.		Barry		Flagler		U.W.F		Miami		Jackson. Univ.	
Total Degree/Gen. Ed. S.H.		125	45	120	46	120	51	120	40	120	45	120	30	120	36④	120	24-25	120	36
Courses		Hrs	Cert	Hrs	Cert	Hrs	Cert	Hrs	Cert	Hrs	Cert	Hrs	Cert	Hrs	Cert	Hrs	Cert	Hrs	Cert
Professional Preparation	Ed. Psych.			3	F	3	F			3	F	⑯		4	F	3*	F	3	F
	Soc. Foundations			3	F	3	F	3	F	3*	F			4	F	6*⑫	F	3	F
	Methods	3		27	F	20	F	36	F	15⑨	F			11	F	33	F	36	F
	Clinical			4		3		12		15				21				3	
	Special Ed.					3												3	
	Human Rel./Develop.			3				4								3			
	Electives													6⑪					
	Media									3									
	Psychology					3				6									
	Prof. Studies	35																	
	Totals	38	A	40	A	35	A	55	A	45	A			46	A	45	A	48	A
Student Teaching Hrs.		11	F	10	F	9	F	10	F	9	F	N/A		10	F	9	F	12	F
Academic Specialization	Lower Art	⑦																	
	Lower Music	3																	
	Lower Health/PE																		
	Lower Lang. Arts																		
	Lower Math																		
	Lower Science																		
	Lower Soc. Stud.																		
	Upper Art					3⑧		3											
	Upper Music	3				3										1			
	Upper Health/PE	5				3								2					
	Upper Lang. Arts	6		3		3		3		3						3			
	Upper Math	2				3												4	
	Upper Science					3													
	Upper Soc. Stud.			3		3													
Elective		12		18		4		9		18		N/A		26		17-38		20	

* - lower division course
F - meets Florida state certification requirements
A - state approved program
var - variable amount of credit hours
N/A - not applicable
④ - transfer with a minimum of 60 hrs., 36 of which are general education
⑦ - These are courses offered outside the College of Education (i.e., music education, health education, mathematics education and Eng 4161). Students are required to have 79 hrs. outside of the COE.
⑧ - The university offers "how to teach" courses in these areas also.
⑨ - "Teaching arithmetic" - lower division, 3 credits
⑩ - only exceptional/handicapped children
⑪ - 6 hrs. upper division outside education - may include prerequisites to math, science and social science courses
⑫ - "Social Foundations" (101) lower division. 419 (elementary education) appears to be "Social Foundations of Elementary Education."

CHAPTER SIX

RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

I. IMPROVING TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Introduction

In the last fifty years, a period in which American society has undergone tremendous change, little reform in the basic training model for teacher preparation has taken place. During this period, however, the schools have been assigned new roles with attendant responsibilities for teachers, society has become markedly different, and the research on learning and teaching has expanded greatly. Improvements in the educational achievements of Florida's youth will require competent beginning teachers who are able to meet these significant changes and who are also willing to embrace the challenges of educating youth for life in the twenty-first century. The Task Force recognizes that this will require the recruitment of talented individuals who, after receiving a rigorous and thorough education, would possess a wide range of professional and academic skills. More specifically, beginning teachers should:

1. have conceptual, analytical, and thinking skills
2. be well grounded in the liberal arts and be capable of intellectually engaging young people in general knowledge
3. be knowledgeable in the subjects they teach
4. possess substantive understanding of the knowledge base for effective teaching, develop a corresponding repetoire of instructional strategies, and be able to apply these skills in the education of individuals
5. be professionals able to make instructional decisions based on professional knowledge and research findings rather than just on personal experience
6. represent as a group the cultural diversity of American society
7. care for and be committed to the education of young people.

Investigation of the curricular components of Florida's teacher education programs and the uneven performance of program graduates taking the Florida Teacher Certification Examination, suggest that the state will be hard pressed to develop this large cadre of qualified professional teachers. This is particularly true considering that the state must continue to rely on programs which, generally speaking, are not meeting contemporary needs and future visions. The Task Force wishes to point out that it recognizes that many of the state's universities and colleges are graduating highly qualified and talented prospective teachers and that some programs graduate proportionately high numbers of these individuals. The Task Force found, however, that these programs were more often the exception than the rule. Causes for this variation in program quality could be traced in part to the lack of

rigor characteristic of the state's program approval process. (See Section III, Chapter Five) Therefore, the Task Force concludes that if Florida expects teacher preparation programs to prepare competent beginning teachers, the state must be willing to provide the impetus and resources for their reconceptualization and redesign. Clearly, these programs must become more creative, more professional, and more rigorous.

To accomplish this, the Task Force focused its recommendations on the following areas of concern: subject matter competencies; components related to Florida's social contexts; clinical and field experiences; master's degree teacher preparation programs; the Beginning Teacher Program; staff development; and the universities' commitment to teacher education. The Task Force believes that these recommendations, when implemented, will serve to help the state greatly improve the quality of education in Florida's state-approved teacher preparation programs.

A. Subject Matter Competencies

SUBJECT MATTER COMPETENCE FOR ELEMENTARY AND SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS, PARTICULARLY BUT NOT EXCLUSIVELY IN READING, MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE, NEEDS TO BE STRENGTHENED AND DEMONSTRATED.

PROSPECTIVE MIDDLE AND SECONDARY TEACHERS SEEKING CERTIFICATION IN A CONTENT AREA SHOULD TAKE A BROADLY BASED PROGRAM APPROPRIATE TO EXISTING SECONDARY CURRICULUM AND EQUIVALENT IN HOURS TO A MAJOR IN THE CONTENT AREA.

The Task Force underscores its belief that all teachers must possess thorough knowledge of the subject matter to be taught in order to be effective and that serious academic participation should be secured throughout a prospective teacher's education. If teachers are not equipped adequately in the subject matter, they are not only likely to be less confident in the classroom, but are more likely to make factual errors in their teaching.

The Task Force wishes to emphasize that coursework for academic specialization should be required whenever feasible, at the upper division level. It is in these subject matter courses that students learn interpretative skills. Without at least a cursory understanding of subject matter at this level, secondary teachers and elementary teachers would be hard pressed to be fully effective in the classroom.

The Task Force further believes that secondary education majors in Florida should be required to take, when appropriate, an equivalent number of hours of upper division subject matter as would be required of a liberal arts and sciences graduate. They recognize, however, that some programs will find it difficult to meet this requirement in

specific terms. For example, social studies teachers must take a variety of courses in the social sciences including history, philosophy, geography, economics, political science, and anthropology in order to teach this subject effectively. Science teachers often are required to teach a variety of science courses such as biology, physics, and chemistry, rather than one specific discipline. For these majors the Task Force believes that the variety, intensity and rigor of course content must be related to their special needs in the classroom. According to a survey of selected secondary programs as described in undergraduate catalogues in Florida, most are in compliance with the tenor of this recommendation. Further, telephone interviews with representatives of secondary education and liberal arts and sciences departments indicate that this high degree of compliance is a result of communication and cooperation between colleges. These interviews also verified that information related to program requirements in catalogues are often incomplete and therefore subject to misinterpretation.

While secondary education majors are exposed to a reasonably sufficient number of upper division courses in the liberal arts, the same cannot be said of elementary education majors. Because these individuals are subject to state certification requirements and graduates are responsible for teaching a variety of subjects, there is little room in their programs for subject matter course work at the upper division level. For example, at Florida International University, the program in elementary education requires a total of 63 semester hours of education courses, which is the equivalent of four semesters of full time enrollment. In these 63 hours, there is not one requirement for coursework aimed at the development of academic specialization, which suggests that students graduate from these programs without ever having to take an upper division course in subject matter content unless it is added to their program as an elective. Education courses required of elementary education majors do cover some aspects of academic specialization, but only as they relate to methods of teaching a particular discipline. Elementary education students at Florida International University are required to take one course (3 hours) in health and physical education for children, 3 courses (9 hours) in communication skills, one methods course (3 hours) each in social studies, mathematics, science, evaluation, and art or music in the elementary school.

Furthermore, teacher candidates themselves recognize this as a problem in their training. Interviews with elementary and exceptional education student interns at Florida State University indicated that they were comfortable with their pedagogical expertise but not with teaching subject matter, and more courses in subject matter would have been desirable.

The Task Force does not believe this lack of coursework for academic specialization is acceptable if quality teachers are to appear in Florida's classrooms. Teachers must be able to demonstrate competence. The Task Force recognizes, however, that this competence may be demonstrated in a fashion other than through coursework. For example, proficiency examinations such as CLEP would be acceptable.

Finally, the Task Force wishes to emphasize that academic departments in Colleges of Arts and Sciences should give serious attention to the question of offering special upper division courses for teachers that differ somewhat from those taken by regular majors. The standard of performance demanded should be just as high -- probably higher -- but the emphasis should be different, with attention given less to specialization than to fundamental processes and principles of the discipline. Careful attention should also be given to the question of whether the total pattern laid out for the major provides for some of the particular needs of teachers. English teachers, for example, should get work in advanced composition, in advanced grammar, and in the history of the language. History teachers need some work in historiography and the basic methods of the historian, and they need to learn to think historically.

B. Course Components Related to Florida's Social Contexts

GRADUATES OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS SHOULD HAVE A COMPONENT RELATED TO THE VARYING SOCIAL CONTEXTS WHICH EXIST IN FLORIDA SUCH AS URBAN OR RURAL SOCIOLOGY, SOCIOLOGY OF THE FAMILY, CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY, OR MINORITIES IN AMERICAN SOCIETY.

The Task Force recognized that educators in Florida face a diversity of cultural and social norms which are unique to the state. Increasing urbanization, significant numbers of rural communities, economically disadvantaged populations, a significant migrant population, and the continual influx of immigrant groups into the state creates a diversity in Florida not generally replicated in other states. In addition, international trends make it clear that cross-language and cross-cultural interaction will become increasingly more frequent. If Florida youth are to be educated at the level necessary to participate effectively in Florida's social contexts, those responsible for their instruction must also be competent to function in diverse environments and to educate their students to do so.

C. Clinical and Field Experiences

BY THE END OF THE FIRST SEMESTER OF THE JUNIOR YEAR OF A TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM, EACH STUDENT SHOULD HAVE COMPLETED A FIELD EXPERIENCE BASED ON WORKING WITH YOUTH IN A STRUCTURED AND SUPERVISED SCHOOL SETTING.

The Task Force examined several studies which cite the importance and value of early field experiences to prospective teachers (Lortie, 1975; Scannell, 1982; Steinacher, 1981; Andrew, 1981 and Smith, 1980). These studies indicated that numerous benefits occur when prospective teachers are involved in early field experiences, particularly in supervised school settings. First, by working with children and youth,

students can determine at an early stage if they are interested in pursuing teaching as a career. Second, teacher educators would be able to identify and screen out those candidates clearly ill-suited for the profession before they enter teacher education programs. Third, students would begin to develop and apply practical pedagogical skills early in their training and enhance these skills during their preparatory program. Furthermore, all three benefits represent a substantial savings in time, energy, and costs to programs and individuals.

Early field experiences should be a statewide standard which would be required of students before admission to a teacher education program. However, the Task Force recognizes that some students may not decide to study education until they complete their sophomore year, and these students should not be penalized. Teacher education programs should provide exceptions for these students and create mechanisms whereby they can fulfill this requirement while continuing in the program without substantial loss of time in the sequence of professional study.

The Task Force further recognizes that implementation of this requirement will have an impact on the state's community colleges which will require cooperation and planning between representatives from the local school district, teacher education program, and the community college. If these experiences are to be beneficial, these groups must reach agreements on such factors as the assignment by community colleges of qualified teacher educators to properly supervise these experiences, the design, content, and objectives of the field experience, and the competencies expected from students. (See Section X-B on Community Colleges for additional data and recommendations.)

CLINICAL AND FIELD EXPERIENCES SHOULD BE INCORPORATED INTO VIRTUALLY ALL ASPECTS OF THE PROFESSIONAL PROGRAM.

A program based on clinical and field experiences will ensure that prospective teachers master certain basic tasks of teaching to the point of effective application in an educational setting. The Task Force believes it is particularly important that clinical and field experiences be further integrated into methods courses, as is typical of those methods courses designed, so that practical application of theory can be followed immediately by professional feedback. These experiences in the school should be diverse in character, and should include experiences in schools in different localities and with types of students different from the teacher candidate. Examples of clinical/field experiences could include observation, micro-teaching, video feedback, tutoring, instruction of small reading groups, or working with and assisting a classroom teacher in such tasks as preparation of curriculum materials, giving assistance to children, and supervising tests. Students with limited potential can be provided with assistance or counseled toward alternative careers at a timely point in their undergraduate programs.

Frequent and early field experiences in a teacher preparation program will require considerable planning by faculty and administrators in colleges of education if these experiences are to be successful. The Task Force thus wishes to encourage teacher education programs to work with local school districts to design and develop these plans for effective field experiences.

CLINICAL COMPONENTS WITH A STUDENT-TEACHER RATIO OF 12:1 NEED TO BE ADEQUATELY FUNDED.

There is little question that clinical aspects of programs require special settings, equipment, and personnel. Small classes, with a 12:1 student to teacher ratio, video and audio equipment, well-qualified and well-trained cooperating classroom teachers, and a sufficient number of qualified instructors all contribute to additional program costs. Universities should recognize the costs of teacher education programs based on clinical and field experiences when allocating funds to colleges of education.

D. Master's Degree Programs for Teacher Education

INCREASED SOCIETAL DEMANDS, THE NECESSITY FOR A WELL-ROUNDED GENERAL EDUCATION AND MASTERY OF SUBJECT MATTER, A RAPIDLY EXPANDING KNOWLEDGE BASE FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING AND THE ECONOMIC ADVANTAGES ASSOCIATED WITH THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMPETENT PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS SUGGEST THAT THE YOUTH OF OUR STATE SHOULD HAVE THE BENEFIT OF TEACHERS WHO ARE PRODUCTS OF MORE RIGOROUS, SOPHISTICATED PREPARATION PROGRAMS.

THE STATE SHOULD PILOT AT LEAST THREE MASTER'S DEGREE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS ON THE BASIS OF COMPETITIVE PROPOSALS. THE PROPOSALS SHOULD SHOW EVIDENCE THAT PROGRAMS HAVE BEEN RECONCEPTUALIZED AND REDESIGNED TO:

-HAVE A STRONG GENERAL EDUCATION COMPONENT
-HAVE A SIGNIFICANT COMPONENT RELATED TO ACADEMIC SPECIALIZATION
-HAVE A PROFESSIONAL COMPONENT BASED ON PEDAGOGICAL THEORY AND CLINICAL AND FIELD EXPERIENCES
-REQUIRE CANDIDATES TO BE PROFICIENT IN THE USE OF COMPUTERS IN INSTRUCTION
-REQUIRE CANDIDATES FOR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHING TO HAVE A STUDENT INTERNSHIP IN AT LEAST TWO GRADE LEVELS (ONE EACH IN THE PRIMARY AND INTERMEDIATE LEVELS)
-REQUIRE CANDIDATES FOR SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHING TO HAVE A STUDENT INTERNSHIP IN AT LEAST TWO AREAS WITHIN THE SUBJECT MATTER DISCIPLINE AND AT THE INTERMEDIATE AND SENIOR HIGH LEVELS

-REQUIRE CANDIDATES IN EXCEPTIONAL STUDENT EDUCATION TO HAVE A STUDENT INTERNSHIP IN AT LEAST TWO APPROPRIATE AREAS, ONE OF WHICH MAY BE IN A REGULAR CLASSROOM
-CULMINATE IN A MASTER'S DEGREE.

IN ADDITION TO COMPETITIVE PROPOSALS, THE LEGISLATURE SHOULD DIRECT THE STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM TO MAKE THE RECONCEPTUALIZATION AND REDESIGN OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS A MAJOR PRIORITY FOR NEW OR SEPARATE QUALITY IMPROVEMENT FUNDS.

During the last several decades the nation's public schools have been assigned new roles with attendant responsibilities for teachers; society has become markedly more complex and demanding; and the research and theory on learning and schooling has expanded greatly. Clearly, when taking these factors into account, elementary and secondary school teaching are more complex and demanding professions today than ever before. A more demanding profession requires prospective teachers to have greater knowledge in the subject matter as well as strong pedagogic training which more fully integrates educational research with clinical and field experiences.

As a profession, teacher education has not kept pace with the growth and development of preparation programs in other fields. For example, during the past fifty years, the time required to be a lawyer has increased from five years to seven, a pharmacist from four years to five, and it typically takes five years for an individual to complete a program in engineering. But over the past fifty years there has been no parallel increase in the requirements to become a teacher (Smith and Street, 1980).

During the past ten to fifteen years however, great strides have been made in the generation of knowledge associated with effective teaching and learning. Many educators claim that there are not enough hours in the traditional four year teacher preparation curriculum to permit programs to meet these demands and favor extending the length of programs to five, six, and seven years. Lawrence Cremin (1978), for example, has recommended a six year program combining the bachelor's degree and a doctorate in teaching. B.O. Smith (1981) has proposed that prospective secondary school teachers first obtain bachelor's degrees with an academic major, including other academic work in the social and behavioral sciences related to learning, schooling, and pedagogy, then complete a two year master's degree program in education. Many other distinguished and nationally prominent experts in teacher education, acting either as individuals or collectively, could easily be added to this list.

Some institutions of higher education have responded to these arguments and have increased the length of their teacher education programs to five years. Austin College in Sherman, Texas, for example, offers a five year Master of Arts program which emphasizes the liberal arts as well as classroom teaching experiences. At Austin, students are required to major in a traditional subject matter discipline and receive

a Bachelor of Arts in that discipline after four years. During the freshman and sophomore years, they are required to enroll in two noncredit education seminars which include field experiences and discussion groups. Candidates also take at least fifty hours of supervised classroom teaching in the senior year and complete one full term as interns during the fifth year. Students must apply for admission to the graduate year and are required to take the Graduate Record Examination and have an acceptable grade point average in their Bachelor of Arts program (Hall et al, 1980; Steinacher, 1981).

In 1974, the University of New Hampshire began to offer an integrated undergraduate-graduate five year teacher education program. Here, as at Austin, the program is based on a solid and rigorous general education and pedagogical courses which more fully integrate theory with practical teaching experiences. Making extensive use of classroom teachers as adjunct instructors and field supervisors, the New Hampshire program provides students, usually in the sophomore year, with early experiences in schools where they serve as teaching assistants and are encouraged to take on teaching responsibilities. As in the Austin program, there is no education major offered. Students seeking secondary school certification select a major in a subject related to their teaching field. No specific major or majors are required of elementary school candidates, and they select an undergraduate major from almost any offered at the university. After four years, students receive a Bachelor of Arts degree and then must apply to both the Education Department and the University's Graduate School for admission to a fifth year of study. To determine admission, several criteria are considered, including the undergraduate grade point average, letters of recommendation, scores on the aptitude section of the Graduate Record Examination, and related work experience. The fifth year of study usually includes a full school year internship plus one or two summers of graduate coursework (Andrew, 1982).

A third example of a five year program is provided at the University of Kansas. In his testimony to the Task Force, School of Education Dean, Dale Scannell stated that students at his institution are required to take sixty hours of general education courses, forty hours of course work in the subject matter related to teaching fields--equivalent to the number of hours required of a liberal arts major--and sixty-two hours of professional education courses. Heavy emphasis is placed on practical teaching experience beginning in the freshman year, and all but one of the professional education courses has a field component. By the time students intern in the fifth year, they have received 250 clock hours of experience in the schools. Student teaching takes place in the fifth year on a split schedule, so that all program graduates have two student teaching experiences in different schools in different grades and/or subject matter areas. If they desire, students may receive a bachelor's degree at the end of the first four years, although they are not recommended for certification until completion of the fifth year. Plans are in progress within the university to provide a master's degree at the end of the fifth year.

According to program administrators, these three five year programs were established due to a belief that during the last fifty years

improvements to teacher education have taken place in a piecemeal fashion and have resulted in an erosion of both the liberal arts and professional components of programs. Clearly they resulted from a desire to place more emphasis on clinical and field experiences, rigorous training in academic discipline, and pedagogical coursework more fully integrated with educational research.

In presentations to the Task Force, both Dr. Robert Bryan, Vice-President of Academic Affairs at the University of Florida, and Dr. Stephen Altman, Vice-President of Academic Affairs at the Florida International University, recognized the need to extend the academic preparation of teachers to five years. The Task Force also considered testimony presented by nationally recognized scholars in the field of teacher education, who articulated the case for extended teacher education programs.

The Task Force thus concludes that it is necessary for the state's teacher preparation programs to be redesigned and reconceptualized and that in doing so, some institutions in Florida should be encouraged to extend the length of their programs. We are persuaded in large part because some of the state's programs lack sufficient depth and rigor. This is especially true in the light not only of the current expectations for teachers, but of the anticipated demands of the twenty-first century.

The Task Force further concludes that it is not desirable for the state to mandate that all approved programs become five-year extended programs. The Task Force does not believe there is only one approach to delivering creative and effective teacher education programs in this developmental period. Some of Florida's public and private state-approved programs, currently in four to four and one-half years and because of their unique characteristics -- small or large, clinically-based or experimental, do and can continue to graduate quality teacher candidates each year. The Task Force commends the effort of those institutions and encourages them to consider the appropriate recommendations contained in this report related to improving the academic and pedagogical education of teachers, and to redesign where necessary.

Minority Statement

The Task Force wishes to point out that two members, Sam Ryle and Elizabeth Kentosh, were of the opinion that the bachelor's degree within extended programs in elementary and secondary education should be in the College of Arts and Sciences. The following minority statement expresses this viewpoint.

> Students who participate in a five-year program in Colleges of Education leading to secondary and elementary certification shall complete, as part of the program, the requirements for a Bachelor of Arts or a Bachelor of Science degree in a College of Arts and Sciences. Those students in a five-year program

who are working toward certification in special education may be exempted from the requirement of obtaining a bachelor's degree in the College of Arts and Sciences.

E. Relationship between Teacher Education Programs and the Beginning Teacher Program

TEACHER EDUCATION FACULTY SHOULD HAVE AN INTEGRAL ROLE IN THE BEGINNING TEACHER PROGRAM.

The Task Force supports the position that teacher education faculty should be involved in appropriate aspects of the Beginning Teacher Program. Faculty from various institutions working with school district and Department of Education personnel have been involved in the development and implementation of the Florida Performance Measurement System. This has included organizing the knowledge derived from the research into domains of teaching behavior, developing the training materials and evaluation instruments, and participating in the training program on the use of the performance measurement system.

To date, however, there has not been a substantial involvement of teacher education faculty in the components of the Beginning Teacher Program. The Task Force's faculty survey results suggest that only one out of ten faculty responding were on a Beginning Teacher Program Support Team. One limitation to faculty involvement is lack of funds. Although funds are provided to train district personnel on the performance measurement system, staff development funds are not available for teacher education faculty. (See related recommendation under staff development).

A number of benefits for faculty involvement in the Beginning Teacher Program can be identified. First, if faculty are to make significant changes in preservice programs, then they must be involved in gathering observational data on their graduates. Second, if the model for performance measurement is to be used for preservice teachers as well, then faculty must increase knowledge and skills in utilizing the model in the public school setting. Third, an expected outcome of the Beginning Teacher Program is to increase the involvement of preservice teacher educators in the continuing professional development of teachers. If these benefits are to be realized, faculty must be involved substantially in the program. As such, their expertise and involvement is fundamental to the success of this emerging model.

TO HELP IN TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT, LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS SHOULD PROVIDE COLLEGES OF EDUCATION WITH APPROPRIATE DATA ON GRADUATES ENROLLED IN THE BEGINNING TEACHER PROGRAM SUCH AS

PEDAGOGICAL SKILL PERFORMANCE AND SUBJECT MATTER COMPETENCY.

The major goal of Florida's Beginning Teacher Program is to improve the performance of all beginning teachers through a comprehensive program of support, training, and documentation of specified teaching competencies during the first year of teaching. Teachers now entering the field are expected to incorporate expanded professional knowledge into teaching and also employ professional skills in practice. Likewise, educators of preservice teachers have been expected to modify their preparatory programs in an effort to ensure that the knowledge base on teacher effectiveness is being combined with the Florida generic teaching competencies and integrated into the preservice teacher education experience. Although the Beginning Teacher Program and performance measurement system are experiencing the pains of their first year of implementation, comprehensive and significant results are expected in the years to come. Of primary importance to teacher educators should be the program outcome identified by the Florida Coalition for the Development of a Performance Evaluation System:

> Utilization of feedback about the performance of teachers can be provided for program revision and evaluation at the preservice level of training to provide a common knowledge base for professional development (Coalition, 1982).

The Task Force supports the development of a systematic plan for gathering evaluative data on the graduates of Florida's teacher education programs so that feedback can be provided and improvements made in preservice teacher education programs.

> ALL SUPERVISING TEACHERS AND UNIVERSITY FACULTY INVOLVED WITH STUDENT TEACHERS SHOULD BE ABLE TO MEET CRITERIA ESTABLISHED FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE BEGINNING TEACHER PROGRAM.
>
> FACULTY WHO ARE INVOLVED IN THE PRESERVICE EDUCATION OF TEACHERS SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO SERVE PERIODICALLY ON A SCHOOL-BASED BEGINNING TEACHER SUPPORT TEAM. WHEN APPROPRIATE, THIS SERVICE SHOULD BE RECOGNIZED AS A CRITERION FOR PROMOTION AND TENURE.

One of the purposes of the Beginning Teacher Program is to verify that teachers in their first year can perform in a satisfactory manner, as well as possess competencies such as planning, management of student conduct, instructional organization, presentation of subject matter, communication, and evaluation. Graduates of Florida's preservice teacher education programs are required to enter the Beginning Teacher Program and to exhibit these competencies. State Board Rule 6A-5.75 requires that a consistent formative and summative evaluation process be developed to ensure consistency from teacher to

teacher, school to school, and district to district within the state. The Task Force believes that an appropriate approach for supervising faculty to become familiar with the measurement system used in the Beginning Teacher Program would be for them to participate in the Beginning Teacher Program.

F. Staff Development for Teacher Education

TEACHER EDUCATION FACULTY, WHERE APPROPRIATE, SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED TO RETURN TO THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS FOR AT LEAST ONE SEMESTER ON A PERIODIC BASIS. SERVICE COULD BE PROVIDED AS A CLASSROOM TEACHER, AS A DISTRICT OR SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR, AS AN INSERVICE EDUCATOR OR IN A VARIETY OF OTHER WAYS. AN AGREEMENT SHOULD BE ARTICULATED BETWEEN THE SCHOOL DISTRICT AND THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND SHOULD INCLUDE SHARED COSTS FOR THE SABBATICAL, FUNDS FOR TRAVEL, COLLABORATION WITH OTHER DISTRICTS, FACULTY EXCHANGE, AND OTHER NECESSARY COMPONENTS.

FUNDS SHOULD BE ALLOCATED TO COLLEGES OF EDUCATION FOR FACULTY STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES. FUNDS COULD BE USED FOR SCHOOL-RELATED PROJECTS, RESEARCH, OR FOR TRAINING RELATED TO MANDATED CHANGES IN PUBLIC SCHOOL PROGRAMS.

Staff development for teacher education faculty is primarily limited to sabbaticals, conferences and meetings and can vary form institution to institution. However, in most cases it is unstructured and informal. The Task Force's faculty survey found that 50 percent of the respondents reported no participation in staff development activities last year. Activities for those who did participate ranged from department/college level seminars and workshops (2.3 percent), working with the Beginning Teacher Program (9 percent), to funded research and development activities (1 percent). The scope and character of such activities by individuals and by faculty as a group does not necessarily seem to be a function of university size nor its public or private status. Preliminary findings would suggest that, where staff development activities are supported by administration and colleagues as being an important and integral part of professional and programmatic growth and development, greater numbers of faculty engaged in such activities and with greater frequency. In a broad context, staff development for teacher education faculty is needed for development or improvement of skills in teaching or advising, growth in research proficiency, and acquisition of new skills or redirection of training. Collaboration and cooperation between public schools and professors in the colleges of education should be essential ingredients for effective staff development.

Research has suggested that major changes in staff development are necessary if colleges of education are to train highly effective teachers. A particularly important change concerns the roles played by

teacher education professors, since higher standards for teacher preparation and certification, longer and more intensive training programs, and greater accountability for quality are being demanded. Some studies have indicated that a professional development plan should be required of all teacher education faculty and clearly integrated with the institution's mission and need. A state law in Oklahoma, in fact, requires this.

While Section 22 of the 1981/84 Agreement between the Florida Board of Regents, the State University System and the United Faculty of Florida provides for professional development programs, its primary area of focus concerns leave time and sabbaticals. No other mention is made of staff development of university professors within Board of Regents policy.

The Legislature has been relatively unresponsive to needs for updating teacher education faculty. New legislation has been developed for public school teachers, one element of which includes staff development. However, funds have not been provided for college of education faculty development. Sabbatical funds are limited, travel funds to attend conferences are scarce, and funds for any organized staff development nonexistent.

The Task Force believes that teacher educators must maintain their credibility as effective teachers if their preservice and inservice students are to accept their instructional efforts. The public school continues to remain the laboratory for the teacher education professor. A closer working relationship must be established between school districts and colleges of education.

G. University Commitment to Teacher Education

UNIVERSITIES SHOULD GIVE A HIGHER PRIORITY TO TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND SUBMIT A PLAN TO THE BOARD OF REGENTS DESCRIBING IN DETAIL HOW TEACHER EDUCATION WILL BE MADE MORE PROMINENT. THE PLAN SHOULD AT LEAST:

-EVALUATE CURRENT PROGRAMS FOR EFFECTIVENESS

-OUTLINE WAYS TO STRENGTHEN COOPERATIVE EFFORTS BETWEEN COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND OTHER FACULTY

-BE RELEVANT AND RESPONSIVE TO THE UNIQUE NEEDS AND RESOURCES ASSOCIATED WITH EACH INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION

-PROVIDE DETAILED IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES.

IN AN EFFORT TO MAKE TEACHER EDUCATION MORE PROMINENT, FUNDS SHOULD BE ALLOCATED TO SUPPORT THE DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION OF THESE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

It is evident that America's universities, traditionally have given low priority to teacher education programs. This tradition has its

historical base in normal schools and state teacher colleges which have always lived in the shadow of the more prestigious private and state universities. When universities began to house and develop schools of education, different "academic pecking orders" were established (for example, the long dominance of the humanities in the Ivy League schools and the strong place of the sciences in many of the land grant institutions). In all cases, schools of education found themselves at the lower end of that order. Even in those cases where schools of education gained prominence (Harvard, Stanford and Ohio State), they have been unable to eliminate low standing on their own campuses, certainly in relation to academic departments in the Arts and Sciences and to most other professional schools (Smelzer et al, 1981).

The Task Force recognizes that Florida's institutions are not immune to this conflict, for the state's teacher education programs also have marginal status. Evidence to support this include low funding allocations by universities for their teacher education programs, a lack in frequency of Quality Improvement Funds for teacher preparation, and procedures for promotion and tenure which fail to recognize service to public schools.

Clearly this is not in the best interest of the state. The development of a quality educational system in Florida is a declared state policy goal. Little improvement will take place until the state's schools employ higher quality teachers. This mandates that the quality of the state's teacher preparation programs be improved, and to accomplish this, universities must give higher prominence to teacher education programs.

II. STRENGTHENING TEACHER EDUCATION STANDARDS

There is no single "best method" for the education of teachers. Identification and establishment of standards for teacher education which will assure that the youth of our state will have high quality instruction was a primary objective of the Task Force. Because no single "best method" for teacher education exists, a statewide prescription of how teachers should be educated is not appropriate. Standards must be established, which assure that only high quality teachers will be certified, and the quality of teacher education programs must be evaluated according to the extent to which graduates meet those standards.

Because the substantial majority of teachers who will be hired in Florida over the next several years will have received their training outside the state, the standards identified must apply to all candidates for certification regardless of the source of their training or number of years of experience ("Teachers for Florida", 1982).

The Task Force believes that excellence in teaching requires that the teacher possess thorough knowledge of the subject to be taught, the professional skills required to teach effectively, and the personal characteristics and attitudes which support the development of

excellence in themselves and in their students. The standards which are recommended below are supportive of these objectives.

A. Strengthening Florida's Teacher Certification Examination

THE PROFESSIONAL QUALIFYING EXAMINATION WHICH IS USED TO CERTIFY FLORIDA TEACHERS MUST BE UPGRADED AND MADE MORE RIGOROUS. THE TASK FORCE RECOMMENDS THAT THE EDUCATION STANDARDS COMMISSION INITIATE THE FOLLOWING:

EITHER THE BASIC SKILLS COMPONENT (THE READING, WRITING, AND MATHEMATICS SECTIONS) OF THE CURRENT FLORIDA TEACHER EXAMINATION SHOULD BE DESIGNED TO BE MORE RIGOROUS OR OTHER VALIDATED EXAMINATIONS SHOULD BE CONSIDERED AS TO THEIR SUITABILITY FOR USE IN MEASURING THE BASIC SKILLS.

THE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION COMPONENT OF THE TEACHER CERTIFICATION EXAMINATION SHOULD BE REWRITTEN AND BASED ON VALIDATED RESEARCH. THE REDEVELOPED TEST SHOULD INVOLVE A HALF OR FULL DAY EXAMINATION COVERING THE STUDENT'S KNOWLEDGE OF SUCH SUBJECTS AS THE RESEARCH ON EFFECTIVE TEACHING, EDUCATIONAL MEASUREMENT, SCHOOL LAW, MAINSTREAMING PRINCIPLES, CLASSROOM DISCIPLINE, EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY, HISTORICAL AND SOCIAL TRENDS, VARYING SOCIAL CONTEXTS IN FLORIDA, COMPUTER PROFICIENCY, AND SUCH OTHER AREAS AS HAVE BEEN VALIDATED.

THE EXAMINATION SHOULD INCLUDE A SUBJECT AREA COMPONENT. ALL TEACHERS SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO PRESENT EVIDENCE OF SCORES EARNED AT A SUITABLE STANDARD ON A VALIDATED SUBJECT TEST(S) APPROPRIATE TO THE CANDIDATE'S PROPOSED TEACHING FIELD (FOR EXAMPLE, BIOLOGY, FRENCH, EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION).

The teacher qualifying examination for all candidates with bachelor's degrees or higher, regardless of the origin of their professional preparation, must be upgraded and made more rigorous. The current process of teacher certification involves substantially more rigorous standards for teachers in state-approved teacher training programs than it does either for students in non-approved Florida teacher training programs or for students who have been trained outside the state of Florida. Students in state-approved teacher training programs are required to earn a score at the fortieth percentile or higher on either the SAT or ACT, whereas persons seeking certification from outside the state or Florida students not enrolled in an approved program need not meet the fortieth percentile criterion.

This is a problem, since Florida hires approximately 5,000 new teachers per year. At least 60 percent of these teachers come from out of state and even larger numbers of "immigrant" teachers are expected in the next few years. Thus, the quality control efforts now in place in Florida are not effective for the majority of Florida's new teaching force, which comes from out of state.

All candidates who wish to obtain a Florida teaching certificate must pass the Florida Teacher Certification Examination. At issue, however, is whether this examination represents the same level of assurance of quality as does a fortieth percentile entry score on the ACT or SAT and the completion of a state-approved program. Available data clearly show that the standards are not equivalent. At the University of South Florida, data are available on the Teacher Certification Examination performances of more than 200 students who earned entrance scores below the fortieth percentile on SAT or ACT (Katzenmeyer, 1982). Of those students, more than 72 percent passed all parts of the examination on the first attempt. This information confirms the widely held belief that the level of difficulty of the examination is lower than the level of difficulty represented by the fortieth percentile entrance score criterion. The professional education section of the examination is particularly suspect, because this section was passed by more than 90 percent of the students with scores below the fortieth percentile.

In addition to the lack of rigor, there are several other concerns about the current teacher examination. First, professional educators believe that there is a strong emerging knowledge and performance base which undergirds the teaching and learning process. Florida has made great advances in the recognition of the bases of effective teaching within the Beginning Teacher Program. This knowledge and performance base, however, is not currently measured by the professional component of the teacher examination. Also, inspection of the items on the examination reveals that the test is limited both in that it does not cover many areas identified as critical to student success and in that the level of knowledge required for correct completion of items is minimal.

Second, only the generic competencies of teaching and not the competencies of the specific curriculum specializations are addressed on the teacher examination. The Task Force noted that several states are currently implementing subject matter examinations for certification. Special subject matter examinations would ensure that teachers of mathematics, science, and other disciplines have the competencies deemed necessary to teach adequately the subject for which they are to be certified.

An additional variable in the process of measuring basic competencies in Florida is the College Level Academic Skills Test (CLAST) which was administered for the first time in October 1982 to all sophomores in Florida institutions of higher education. At this point, it is too early to make an accurate comparison of the Teacher Certification Examination with CLAST. While CLAST scores are required for an Associate of Arts degree to be awarded and for admission to upper

division status, Florida statutes prohibit any other use of CLAST scores prior to August 1, 1984. Also, not all reading, writing, and mathematics competencies were incorporated into the October 1982 version of CLAST. Though it may be premature to compare the competencies measured by the CLAST with those of the Teacher Certification Examination, preliminary judgements suggest that the basic skills competencies measured by CLAST are at a higher level than those measured by the Teacher Certification Examination. Therefore, after August, 1984 it may make little sense for in-state prospective teachers to be tested on competencies by the Teacher Certification Examination two years after the student has mastered competencies measured by CLAST.

The Task Force believes that a quality test is required to add prestige to the process of becoming a certified teacher. Currently, the Florida Teacher Certification Examination lacks this prestige. About 83 percent of teacher candidates pass all four subtests on their first try. Several states interested in implementing a teacher certification examination are analyzing the National Teacher Examination (NTE). Florida originally examined the NTE before developing its own Teacher Certification Examination. However, since only three of the twenty-three generic competencies developed in Florida were measured on the NTE, it was rejected. The NTE has since been revised and is currently undergoing validity studies in a few states. The Task Force believes that the Education Standards Commission should examine this test and other validated tests to determine whether they will provide the necessary standards of level of difficulty and job relatedness for certification of Florida teachers.

Clearly there is need for a rigorous professional qualifying examination which represents a standard that assures a level of knowledge and teaching skills appropriate to effective teaching, and creates a uniform standard for all candidates seeking certification, regardless of the origin of their professional preparation.

WHEN THE FLORIDA TEACHER CERTIFICATION EXAMINATION HAS BECOME MORE RIGOROUS, THE STATE SHOULD DROP THE REQUIREMENT THAT 80 PERCENT OF THE GRADUATES OF ALL STATE-APPROVED TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS MUST PASS THIS EXAMINATION IN ORDER FOR THE PROGRAM TO RETAIN STATE APPROVAL.

If the more rigorous criteria for certification recommended by the Task Force are adopted, it would be punitive to some state-approved teacher education programs to continue to implement the 80 percent rule related to program approval. Currently, Section 240.529, Florida Statutes, requires that 80 percent of the graduates of an approved teacher training program must successfully pass all parts of the Florida Teacher Certification Examination if the program is to maintain state-approved status. Efforts to create a more rigorous certification examination are hampered by this 80 percent rule because many colleges, schools, and departments of education with high minority enrollments and lower scores on the Florida Teacher Certification Examination would be

in clear danger of losing state-approved status -- an unacceptable social and political situation. The Task Force believes that there would be a significant vocal, and justifiable rise in discontent if this were to take place, which would result in a softening of efforts to upgrade the rigor of the examination. However, the Task Force cautions that dropping the 80 percent rule in the absence of implementation of more rigorous examination requirements would represent a significant step backwards in quality assurance.

B. Certification of Distinguished Teachers

A DISTINGUISHED TEACHER CERTIFICATION LEVEL SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED AND BASED ON THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:

THE CANDIDATE MUST HAVE AND DEMONSTRATE SUPERIOR KNOWLEDGE. THIS SHOULD INCLUDE BOTH KNOWLEDGE IN THE SUBJECT AREA(S) APPROPRIATE TO HIS OR HER CERTIFICATE AND KNOWLEDGE OF THE TEACHING/LEARNING PROCESS.

THE CANDIDATE MUST PERFORM IN A SUPERIOR FASHION IN THE CLASSROOM.

THE CANDIDATE SHOULD HAVE MADE POSITIVE CONTRIBUTIONS TO SCHOOLS AND THE TEACHING PROFESSION AND BE RECOMMENDED BY THE FACULTY. POSSIBLE PROCEDURES COULD INCLUDE EVALUATION BY A NEUTRAL BOARD OF A DOSSIER DOCUMENTING SUCH CONTRIBUTIONS PREPARED BY THE CANDIDATE AND COMMENTS ON THE APPROPRIATENESS OF THE CANDIDATE FOR DISTINGUISHED TEACHER STATUS SOLICITED BY THIS BOARD FROM CONCERNED PERSONS.

THE CERTIFICATE SHOULD HAVE A FIVE YEAR LIFE CYCLE. RENEWAL WOULD BE BASED ON DEMONSTRATION OF CRITERIA RELATED TO PERFORMANCE AND CONTRIBUTIONS TO SCHOOLS AND THE PROFESSION.

THE LEGISLATURE SHOULD AUTHORIZE THE EDUCATION STANDARDS COMMISSION, WITH K-12 TEACHERS AND TEACHER EDUCATION FACULTY, TO RECOMMEND SPECIFIC CRITERIA TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR APPROVAL OF THE ABOVE MENTIONED CATEGORIES. CRITERIA SHOULD BE DEVELOPED FOR BOTH INITIAL AND RENEWAL CERTIFICATES.

Among the variables which enter into an individual's decision to enter or remain in a profession are salary, work load and working conditions, opportunity to serve, and perceived potential for gaining self-esteem and the esteem of others.

Ernest Boyer of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching has observed that Americans have a tendency to exalt education

as the foundation of democracy and the architect of our future, while at the same time demeaning teachers. A recent report of the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) has pointed out that, "Improvements in the teaching profession depend not only on tighter selection and better preparation of teachers, but also on public respect and financial rewards for teachers" (Task Force on Higher Education, 1981). Few would doubt that inadequate salaries play an important part in the decline in the average quality of young people entering teacher education, but legislatures and school boards are reluctant to raise the salaries of all teachers now in service in the hope of retaining the best of teachers in the profession and attracting higher quality persons into the profession in the future. The SREB report cooroborates this notion stating that "there is little indication that the public will provide significantly more (financial) support in the face of declining quality. Thus, while salaries are part of the solution, substantially higher pay will have to be linked to a number of quality improvement efforts before the public responds favorably" (Task Force on Higher Education, 1981).

The dilemma for educators is apparent: schools and teachers must improve before salaries and support resources will be increased, but salaries and resources must be increased if the profession is to avoid losing many of its most able members and at the same time attract talented new members.

Most individuals have significant needs for self-esteem. The teaching profession, and individual performance within that profession, must be acceptable if persons are to be productive and take satisfaction in what is done. Exceptionally talented persons in education must have a basis for earning self-esteem and the esteem of others within the context of teaching or they will tend to move to a more satisfying activity. Unfortunately, the operational context of teaching does not adequately provide recognition to superior members of the profession.

A higher level of certification is needed, the standards for which are sufficiently high so that the certification will, in a very short period of time, come to be recognized as a hallmark of excellence among teachers. It is elemental to state that if Florida wants more excellence, the state must reward excellence. The establishment of a distinguished teacher status will allow the state to recognize excellence among teachers and will provide a rational basis for differential financial reward of superior teachers if such a differential reward is judged to be appropriate.

C. Course Requirements for Specialization Certification

ALL COURSE REQUIREMENTS FOR SPECIALIZATION AREA CERTIFICATION, PARTICULARLY THOSE RELATED TO SUBJECT MATTER COMPETENCE, SHOULD BE REVIEWED AND STRENGTHENED. TO ACCOMPLISH THIS, THE TASK FORCE RECOMMENDS THE FOLLOWING:

THE EDUCATION STANDARDS COMMISSION SHOULD CREATE AN ACCELERATED TIMETABLE WHICH REQUIRES SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF REQUIREMENTS IN EACH SPECIALIZATION AREA.

THE EDUCATION STANDARDS COMMISSION SHOULD DEVELOP STANDARDS FOR THE REVISED REQUIREMENTS WHICH INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING:
-FOR SECONDARY EDUCATION, A GOAL SHOULD BE SET FOR EQUATING THE SUBJECT AREA COURSE REQUIREMENTS TO THOSE SPECIFIED FOR LIBERAL ARTS MAJORS. FOR EXAMPLE, A SECONDARY MATHEMATICS EDUCATION TEACHER SHOULD HAVE AN EQUIVALENT NUMBER OF HOURS IN MATHEMATICS AS AN INDIVIDUAL WITH A LIBERAL ARTS MATHEMATICS DEGREE
-SUBJECT MATTER AND PEDAGOGICAL REQUIREMENTS FOR ELEMENTARY, EARLY CHILDHOOD, AND EXCEPTIONAL STUDENT EDUCATION CERTIFICATION SHOULD BE STRENGTHENED. FOR EXAMPLE, A COURSE IN COLLEGE ALGEBRA OR HIGHER MATHEMATICS SHOULD BE REQUIRED.

THE LEGISLATURE SHOULD ALLOCATE FUNDS TO THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION TO INVOLVE CONSULTANTS AND TEACHERS TO HELP FORMULATE THE REVISED REQUIREMENTS FOR SUBMISSION TO THE EDUCATION STANDARDS COMMISSION.

REVIEW OF THE FIRST SET OF REVISED SPECIALIZATION AREA REQUIREMENTS BY THE EDUCATION STANDARDS COMMISSION SHOULD COMMENCE NO LATER THAN JANUARY 1985.

THE NEW STANDARDS, TIMETABLE, AND REVISED REQUIREMENTS SHOULD BE SUBMITTED TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR APPROVAL.

THE LEGISLATURE SHOULD DIRECT THE EDUCATION STANDARDS COMMISSION TO COMPLETE THE EXAMINATION OF ALL CURRENT COURSE REQUIREMENTS FOR SPECIALIZATION CERTIFICATION NO LATER THAN JULY 1, 1990. ANY SPECIALIZATION NOT REVISED AND READOPTED BY THIS DATE WILL BE DISCONTINUED.

THEREAFTER, EACH CERTIFICATION SPECIALIZATION MUST BE REAPPROVED EVERY 10 YEARS.

In examining the current process for modifying course requirements for specialization certification, the Task Force was concerned that the process lacks structure—detailed guidelines, timelines, and standards for revising the requirements. A perusal of the dates of the most recent changes in core course requirements indicates that several specialization area requirements had not been examined since the early 1960s. For example, course requirements for elementary education certification have not been reviewed since 1964, and secondary social

studies, mathematics, and physics have not been revised since 1960. In addition, funds have not been available to the Department of Education to make a concerted effort to involve state professional associations in the examination of Florida certification requirements in respective subject areas on a periodic basis. The current process has been primarily informal; a professional association, such as the Florida Council of Teachers of Mathematics, can recommend changes in specific certification requirements in mathematics when the association finds it appropriate.

Further, current certification requirements in subject matter for secondary education majors are inadequate and fail to ensure that Florida's secondary teachers are prepared to meet the challenges involved in engaging youth in intellectual dialogues. For example, to meet the subject specialization requirement in English an individual must either have a baccalaureate degree in English or complete as little as 30 semester hours of coursework. Additional inadequacy is suggested when one considers that to meet this 30-hour requirement, credit can be given for six hours of freshman English, three hours of speech, and six hours of a foreign language. Thus, it is possible for individuals seeking certification in English to gain approval by taking only 15 hours of English courses beyond the freshman level. The Task Force believes this lack of a statewide quality standard is intolerable and that more rigorous requirements must be developed. (See Chapter Four of this report for greater depth and analysis of the problem.)

The Task Force believes that the Education Standards Commission should examine this apparent weakness in the operation of the Florida teacher certification process and, in so doing, establish a timetable which requires systematic review of requirements in each specialization area.

D. Certification of Non-Degree Vocational Education Teachers

TO ENSURE THAT NON-DEGREE VOCATIONAL TEACHERS ARE APPROPRIATELY CERTIFIED, AND THAT SUCH A CERTIFICATION PROCESS IS SENSITIVE TO THE RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION DEMANDS OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS FOR SUCH SKILLED TEACHERS, THE TASK FORCE RECOMMENDS THAT THE CREDENTIALING PROCESS REQUIRE THE CANDIDATE TO:
-HAVE COMPLETED A HIGH SCHOOL DEGREE;
-HAVE SIX YEARS OF SUCCESSFUL, VERIFIED WORK EXPERIENCE IN THE SPECIFIC OCCUPATIONAL AREA FOR WHICH CERTIFICATION IS REQUESTED (SIX WEEKS OF THAT EXPERIENCE MUST BE WITHIN THE LAST FIVE YEARS AND TWO YEARS OF THAT EXPERIENCE MUST BE AT THE JOURNEYMAN OR SKILLED LEVEL);
-SUCCESSFULLY PASS A NATIONALLY VALIDATED OCCUPATIONAL PROFICIENCY EXAMINATION COVERING THE CONTENT AREAS OF OCCUPATIONAL PROFICIENCY, READING, WRITING, AND TECHNICAL MATHEMATICS SKILLS; AND
-SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETE THE BEGINNING TEACHER PROGRAM.

Vocational teachers of agriculture, business and office education, industrial arts, and home economics become certified in Florida by fulfilling the certification requirements as does the teacher of mathematics, science, and other subject matter disciplines. These vocational teachers must have at least a bachelor's degree with specified course work in education, pass the Teacher Certification Examination, and successfully complete the Beginning Teacher Program. The more rigorous certification standards proposed by the Task Force will also apply to this group of vocational teachers. However, as stipulated in state board rules, vocational teachers who instruct in the trades and industrial areas such as cosmetology, auto body and mechanics, and building construction are not required to have a college degree. But even without a degree, these vocational teachers are still required to pass the Florida Teacher Certification Examination. Data indicate that only 60 percent of these teachers pass in the first attempt. Certainly the more rigorous certification examination which is being proposed by the Task Force would increase this problem.

The Florida Vocational Association has indicated, therefore, that the Florida Teacher Certification Examination may not be appropriate for all non-degree vocational instructors, since the competencies being measured in the examination are curriculum requirements for teacher education programs in Florida's colleges and universities. For those persons a more realistic indicator would be a successful demonstration of proficiency by examination in the vocational area for which certification is requested. Appropriate pedagogical skills would be evidenced in the Beginning Teacher Program.

E. Teacher Education Program Admissions Requirement

FOLLOWING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COLLEGE LEVEL ACADEMIC SKILLS TEST AND COMPARABLE STANDARDS FOR ADMISSION TO THE JUNIOR YEAR, THE LEGISLATURE SHOULD ELIMINATE THE CURRENT TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM ADMISSIONS REQUIREMENT SET FORTH IN SECTION 240.529, FLORIDA STATUTES, RELATED TO THE FORTIETH PERCENTILE SCORE ON THE SAT/ACT.

FOR THE SAKE OF CONSISTENCY, ALL APPLICANTS TO STATE-APPROVED TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS AT PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO PASS THE CLAST TEST BEFORE ADMISSION. IN THESE CASES THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND THE ELIGIBLE INSTITUTIONS SHOULD NEGOTIATE AN AGREEMENT THAT WOULD ASSURE THAT THE TEST IS AVAILABLE EITHER DIRECTLY THROUGH THE INSTITUTIONS OR ON A CONTRACTUAL BASIS WITH A STATE COMMUNITY COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY.

Section 240.529, Florida Statutes, states that all state-approved teacher education program shall require as a prerequisite for admission into the program that a student receive a passing score at the fortieth percentile or above on a nationally standardized college entrance examination. This admission requirement was created to help establish higher academic standards for individuals to qualify as teachers in Florida's public schools as a result of the public's growing concern over poorly prepared teachers in Florida.

The Task Force applaudes this important effort in the development of policies aimed at improving the quality of teachers in the state. The Task Force concludes, however, that if the recommendations of this report concerning strengthened certification course requirement standards and increased rigor of the Florida Teacher Certification Examination are implemented, then the Legislature should eliminate this "fortieth percentile" requirement. The Task Force believes it is more appropriate for the state to concentrate on the application of rigorous qualifying standards for those persons entering the profession than to create equally rigorous barriers for persons attempting to gain entry into programs. This more appropriate emphasis would permit those institutions in Florida whose role and resources may be oriented toward admitting significant numbers of students who have SAT/ACT scores below the fortieth percentile and then working diligently toward bringing them up to higher standards, to carry out these aims and missions. At the same time it would permit those institutions which may want to maintain or raise current standards to do so.

Furthermore, preliminary data related to the College Level Academic Skills Test (CLAST) suggest that this instrument will serve as an admission standard at least equal in rigor to a fortieth percentile score on the SAT/ACT. To have teacher education candidates required to meet two standards of equal value seemed punitive to students and made little sense to the Task Force.

III. PROGRAM APPROVAL AND PROGRAM REVIEW

THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION PROGRAM APPROVAL PROCESS AND THE BOARD OF REGENTS PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS SHOULD BE COMBINED AND BASED ON A COMMON SET OF VALIDATED PROGRAM EVALUATION CRITERIA WHICH REFLECT THE MOST INFORMED INDICATORS OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM QUALITY. IN ORDER TO ACCOMPLISH THIS, THE TASK FORCE OFFERS THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATIONS:

THE EDUCATION STANDARDS COMMISSION, WORKING WITH THE BOARD OF REGENTS, THE STATE BOARD OF INDEPENDENT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, AND OTHER APPROPRIATE GROUPS SHOULD PREPARE A SET OF QUALITY INDICATORS WHICH ARE TO BE ADDRESSED IN PROGRAM APPROVAL AND PROGRAM REVIEW EVALUATIONS OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

STAFF OF THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, THE BOARD OF REGENTS, AND THE STATE BOARD OF INDEPENDENT COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, SHOULD PREPARE NEW STATE BOARD RULES, BASED ON THE INDICATOR AREAS IDENTIFIED BY THE EDUCATION STANDARDS COMMISSION. THESE DRAFT RULES SHOULD SPECIFY THE INDICATORS, PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION BASED ON THE INDICATORS, AND THE CRITERIA WHICH MUST BE MET ON EACH INDICATOR FOR APPROVAL TO BE AWARDED. THE DRAFT RULES SHOULD BE REVIEWED BY ALL OF THE STATE'S TEACHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS AND APPROVED BY THE COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION.

THE DRAFT RULES SHOULD BE SUBMITTED TO THE EDUCATION STANDARDS COMMISSION FOR APPROVAL AND SUBMISSION TO THE STATE BOARD.

NEW STATE BOARD RULES GOVERNING THE COMBINED PROGRAM APPROVAL AND REVIEW PROCESS SHOULD BE IMPLEMENTED BY MARCH 1, 1984 AND SUBSEQUENTLY AT FIVE YEAR INTERVALS.

THE COMBINED PROGRAM APPROVAL AND PROGRAM REVIEW PROCESS FOR STATE-APPROVED TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS SHOULD RECUR IN FIVE YEAR CYCLES, BEGINNING NO LATER THAN JANUARY, 1985.

State Board of Education Rules provide two different processes by which institutions can comply with state requirements for certification of their graduates. In the first process, institutions submit courses to the Department of Education for acceptance to meet the individual course requirements prescribed in State Board of Education Rule 6A-4 for various certification specializations. The second process is one in which a teacher training institution may acquire state program approval status as prescribed in SBER 6A-5. This process requires that institutions design and document a complete teacher training program with admission, screening and graduation requirements specified. A curriculum designed to include Florida's generic teaching competencies must be verified and a responsiveness to the educational needs of Florida's school districts must be an integral part of the program. In addition, there must be evaluation procedures specified in the program for determining that graduates have satisfactorily demonstrated all required competencies. According to SBER 6A-5, the purposes of program approval are to make teacher preparation programs responsive to the educational needs of Florida, to recognize institutions with a serious commitment to quality in teacher education, to encourage flexibility in teacher education program design, to make more effective use of resources and to encourage teacher education as a career-long process.

Institutions seeking state program approval for their teacher education program must complete a self-study report according to criteria specified by the Department of Education. An evaluation team is selected composed of representatives from universities, school districts and the state agency. This team then conducts the on-site visit through

which program approval or non-approval is determined. Programs are approved for one to five years.

Program approval status, which is awarded only to programs for which certification coverage is available, provides graduates of approved programs with the assurance that they have met training requirements for certification. Successful completion of an approved teacher education program entitles an individual to be granted the comparable certification in a state that has signed the Interstate Certification Contract with Florida. Through the Interstate Agreement, Florida has entered a cooperative system whereby the determination of qualifications by another participating state need not be re-examined each time an applicant presents credentials for a job as a teacher. The Interstate Certification Contract assures enough similarity in teacher preparatory programs, qualifications, and any other elements of eligibility for certification that a state is justified in accepting either a candidate for certification or a certified teacher from another participating state without an elaborate reinspection process.

An Academic Program Review is conducted by the Board of Regents as part of the Board's responsibility to plan and evaluate all programs of the State University System. During this review, all programs within a given discipline category, such as teacher education, are evaluated simultaneously in each of the nine state institutions. Criteria used in the process include: faculty qualifications; student recruitment and development; quality of curriculum and instruction provided; adequacy of resources; evidence of program priority at the institution, at the state university system levels and for higher education in Florida; career implications of the program; program administration and management; and articulation of the program with other programs within the institution, with community colleges, and with other public and private institutions in the state. Also included in the program review process is the effect of programmatic decisions on educational and employment opportunities for minorities and women. Outside consultants such as nationally recognized deans and university presidents conduct the program review evaluation. The Board of Regents coordinated the first evaluation of teacher education programs in 1976. Due to other priorities of the Board and a lack of funds for this purpose, a subsequent teacher education program review has not been undertaken.

There are problems specific to the Board of Regents program review process and to the Department of Education's program approval process. The primary problems with program review are that, because of funding problems, the reviews are not being conducted on the planned five year schedule and therefore, those reviews have no direct relationship to funding decisions. Program approval, however, is being conducted on a five-year schedule. Its problems relate to:

-The wide discrepancy in the skills of students graduating from approved programs as indicated by institutional performance on the Florida Teacher Certification Examination
-Expressed dissatisfaction with standards governing program approval and with the process for changing those standards
-A lack of specificity in the evaluation process which results in

less rigor than is desirable
-Evaluation results that are not tied to resource allocation at either the institutional or the state level.

Regardless of the cause, present program evaluation criteria are not yielding the consistant quality and coordination of resources desired. The Task Force believes that a new program evaluation procedure is warranted. This procedure should be based on a common set of validated criteria and should combine the expertise of the Board of Regents and the Department of Education, as well as others. It will also reduce the number of evaluation visits the state must support, and help assure a consistent message from state leadership regarding the expectations of institutions housing teacher education programs.

The Task Force has identified an initial set of indicators which they believe to be basic to the quality of teacher education programs. Some of these indicators should also be evaluated as a part of the Florida Teacher Certification Examination. These are:

Outcome Indicators

Evidence that program graduates possess or understand:
-a validated knowledge base of teacher effectiveness, current state mandates affecting school curriculum and organization, and national trends and issues in education;
-the knowledge and skills in the humanities and the sciences necessary for them to act as models of educated individuals;
-the use of computers in instruction;
-the knowledge and skills necessary to function in the diverse social and cultural environments found in Florida;
-the performance skills identified in the Beginning Teacher Program;
-appropriate skills in educational diagnosis, remediation of students, and modifying curriculum for exceptional students who are mainstreamed into regular programs;
-the developmental stages and learning strategies of students and are able to apply these successfully;
-content knowledge and skill in the appropriate teaching field.

Program Indicators

Evidence that programs:
-develop collaborative relationships between K-12 teachers, exceptional student educators, and teacher education faculty which result in identifiable improvement in all programs;
-evaluate graduates on the criteria for effective teaching developed by the Beginning Teacher Program;
-have planned staff development activities which ensure that faculty are constantly aware of and skilled in current trends in teaching, learning, and human development, and in the realities of public schools;
-use appropriate criteria for selection of supervising teachers;
-have conducted a recent and regularly scheduled review of the teacher education program and curriculum;
-develop appropriate coordination between liberal arts and college of education faculty;

-utilize specified promotion and tenure criteria which encourage and reward excellence in teaching, service to K-12 education, and applied research in teacher effectiveness and public school curriculum;
-conduct appropriate follow-up evaluation of program graduates;
-are committed to improving K-12 education;
-incorporate early and effective field experiences for program participants;
-have appropriate fiscal support for teacher education, including an adequately funded clinical teaching component.

IV. Assuring Adequate Funding for Teacher Education

A NEW FUNDING SYSTEM FOR TEACHER EDUCATION BINDING LEGISLATIVE CONSEQUENCE WITH UNIVERSITY ACTION SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED. THE TASK FORCE THEREFORE RECOMMENDS CHANGES IN THE SYSTEM FOR FUNDING TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

IN ADDITION, EFFORTS TO IMPROVE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS SHOULD BE A MAJOR PRIORITY FOR NEW OR SEPARATE QUALITY IMPROVEMENT FUNDS FOR THE NEXT SEVERAL YEARS. THESE FUNDS SHOULD BE DISTRIBUTED TO STATE UNIVERSITIES ON THE BASIS OF PLANNED TEACHER EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT AGENDAS WHICH:
-BUILD ON PROGRAM EVALUATIONS COMPLETED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND OTHERS
-ARE DEVELOPED BY THE UNIVERSITIES WITH THE PARTICIPATION OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, PUBLIC SCHOOLS, COLLEGES OF EDUCATION, AS WELL AS THE LEGISLATURE
-ADDRESS NEWLY ESTABLISHED INDICATORS OF QUALITY FOR STATE APPROVAL OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS
-REPRESENT A REDESIGN AND RECONCEPTUALIZATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

THE SYSTEM FOR FUNDING TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN FLORIDA SHOULD BE CHANGED. THE TASK FORCE SUPPORTS CURRENT EFFORTS TO MOVE TO A PROGRAM-BASED HIGHER EDUCATION FUNDING FORMULA WHICH IS LESS RELIANT ON ENROLLMENT LEVELS AND MORE RELIANT ON UNIVERSITY ACCOUNTABILITY. THE TASK FORCE RECOMMENDS THAT TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS BE AMONG THE FIRST PROGRAMS REVIEWED AND FUNDED UNDER THE NEW FORMULA. A REVISED SYSTEM SHOULD RESULT IN:
-ADEQUATE FUNDING OF THE CLINICAL COMPONENTS OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS INCLUDING A SPECIFIED MAXIMUM STUDENT-TEACHER RATIO OF 12:1
-A MORE COMPLETE INFORMATION BASE ON BOTH THE QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITATIVE INDICATORS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION IN FLORIDA
-A MORE ADEQUATE AND EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

Adequate funding is a necessary, though not sufficient, condition for teacher education program quality. Adequate funding means adequate staff, reasonable faculty workloads, appropriate supervision, responsible knowledge production, and other conditions necessary to meet public expectations in the preparation of school personnel. The Task Force, after an analysis of teacher education funding in Florida, believes that such funding is not presently provided in Florida's public universities.

The Task Force contracted with Dr. Bruce Peseau of the University of Alabama for an assessment of productivity and funding factors related to Florida teacher education programs. In his study, Dr. Peseau compared the funding of teacher education programs in Florida to national norms on teacher education program expenditures, to state expenditures on public school student education, to student credit hour expenditures in other program areas, and in terms of a complex series of resource and productivity variables. Results showed that teacher education in Florida is essentially underfunded. Summary charts of these results are found in Appendix E. His analysis also revealed wide discrepancies among universities in expenditures on teacher education. In one case, the difference in student credit hour expenditures between two universities amounted to a 300 percent difference.

The Task Force believes that three primary factors contribute to inadequacy and inequity in teacher education funding in Florida: First, there a history of teacher education programs being accorded minimum status and importance within universities. Second, teacher education programs are classified in Florida as "classroom" oriented, rather than based on "performance" or "laboratory" experiences. Third, university administrators are allowed considerable discretion in funding academic programs. These factors combine to assure that teachers are consistently denied the financial and administrative support necessary for a quality preparation program.

The present system for funding the instructional cost of higher education in Florida makes it extremely difficult to identify, much less influence, teacher education program funding. Funds are appropriated by the legislature to support higher education on the basis of Full Time Equivalent (FTE) student enrollments. These funds are then transferred through the Board of Regents to the universities. A university's accountability to the State University System and the Legislature is only in terms of global, not categorical, authorizations and expenditures. Individual academic program funding is not considered to be under any authorization constraints (other than line-items) nor is it required that individual program funding be reported. Even though state-level planning attempts to discriminate among the various program complexities and related minimum cost requirements, and this planning aids the Legislature in their considerations of adequacy and equity in using the state's limited resources, those differences are not constraints within the universities.

The higher education funding system is further complicated by the informal productivity formula often used by the Board of Regents and universities. This formula, developed in 1976 by the State University

System, establishes three categories and four levels of program funding and productivity factors. The formula places teacher education in the lowest funding category (classroom as opposed to laboratory or performance) and among the highest productivity expectation categories (class size and number of student credit hours generated per faculty member). This practice clearly works against quality. The system serves as an informal policy for the Board of Regents and for the Academic Vice-Presidents responsible for academic program funding allocations. The Task Force strongly believes that this formula acts to discourage a university from investing in high quality teacher education programs, and should be revised immediately.

There appears to be a significant accountability gap between state level budgeting decisions and the universities' allocation of funds for teacher education. It is the belief of the Task Force that this gap serves to perpetuate inequities that have developed in teacher education over time, forcing it to become more conservative, show little creativity, and to attempt to do more than is reasonably possible with insufficient resources. It is not surprising that the public, the schools, the universities and the Legislature have low regard for teacher education.

The Task Force believes improvements in the quality of teacher education in Florida are dependent on the implementation of a new system of budgeting and financial accountability for higher education. That new system should require a two-part process involving the universities, the Board of Regents, and the Department of Education in a coordinated effort, and be able to assure that the Legislature and other state-level decision makers are aware of what is being spent and of the results of those expenditures. The first part of the process involves the allocation of Quality Improvement Funds for teacher education program improvement efforts. The second involves the funding of teacher education programs using a program budgeting approach.

Quality Improvement Funds

Quality Improvement Funds have not been used to improve teacher education programs despite continued expressions of concern about the quality of teacher training. Although individual programs at specific institutions have received funding, none has been directed toward overall program improvement efforts. For example, the University of West Florida received funds for vocational education, the University of North Florida, funds for deaf education and Florida International University, funds for gifted education. The use of Quality Improvement Funds is necessary prior to the restructuring of the formula itself to support the total redesign process necessary to assure the improvement that the Task Force believes is critical to producing the level and consistency of quality desired in Florida-trained teachers. The Task Force does not wish to divert funds away from current quality improvement efforts and therefore proposes that the state establish a new or separate category to accomplish this task.

Program Budgeting

Under the higher education funding system suggested by the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission, academic programs could transfer one at a time to a program budgeting model immediately following a statewide review of the program. In this way, funding decisions could gradually be transferred to a programmatic data base which would identify the resources needed to provide the quality of program desired for a specified number of students. Expenditures could then be traced to specific academic programs. Since Florida institutions, public and private, presently are producing less than half of the teachers needed to staff Florida classrooms, such planning is especially critical for teacher education. The Task Force further believes that the review itself should be the joint responsibility of the Department of Education and the Board of Regents. (See recommendations on program approval and program review in Section III of this chapter.)

V. INCENTIVES FOR PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS

A. Scholarships/Loans

THE TASK FORCE RECOMMENDS THAT THE STATE ESTABLISH TWO SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMS TO BE IMPLEMENTED IN 1983, WHICH WOULD ATTRACT BOTH TALENTED YOUTH TO THE TEACHING PROFESSION AND ATTRACT STUDENTS INTO TEACHING CAREERS IN AREAS OF CRITICAL SHORTAGE. THE FIRST TYPE WOULD OFFER TWO HUNDRED HIGHLY COMPETITIVE SCHOLARSHIPS AT $4,000 PER YEAR TO PAY THE UPPER DIVISION COLLEGE COSTS OF PROSPECTIVE FLORIDA TEACHERS IN ANY STATE-APPROVED TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM. THE SECOND CATEGORY WOULD MAKE AVAILABLE FIVE HUNDRED SCHOLARSHIPS TO PAY FOR THE COSTS OF TUITION AND BOOKS FOR PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS, COMMENCING WITH THE FRESHMAN YEAR. IN THE SECOND PROGRAM, HOWEVER, THE TOTAL AWARD FOR TUITION AND BOOKS COULD NOT EXCEED THE COST OF ATTENDING A PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE OR STATE UNIVERSITY. SCHOLARSHIP RECIPIENTS WOULD BE ABLE TO REPAY THE AWARD AMOUNT EITHER BY TEACHING FULL TIME IN A FLORIDA PUBLIC SCHOOL FOR ONE YEAR FOR EACH YEAR THE SCHOLARSHIP IS GRANTED OR IN CASH IN SCHEDULED MONTHLY PAYMENTS AT THE CURRENT INTEREST RATE.

As stated earlier, the number of academically talented students entering the teaching profession has declined over the past decade. This problem has been attributed to several factors such as low teaching salaries, the expansion of career opportunities for females and minorities, and unrewarding work conditions. Florida is also experiencing critical teaching shortages which are characteristic of shortages nationwide. For example, a 1981 survey conducted by the Association for School, College and University Staffing indicated that

43 states are experiencing shortages of high school mathematics teachers and 42 states reported shortages of physics teachers. Shortages were also reported to a lesser extent in chemistry, biology, and earth science (Atkin, 1982).

As stipulated in Section 240.407, Florida Statutes, when Florida was experiencing similar teacher shortages in the fifties and sixties, a scholarship/loan program was available for the purpose of attracting the state's youth into the teaching profession. In 1971, the year in which the program was terminated, 1550 general scholarship loans were available for the preparation of teachers. Each scholarship loan had a value of $600 per year for four years. This amount was commensurate with the tuition costs at that time. Scholarship loans were allocated to each school district in proportion to the K-12 student enrollment, and candidates were recommended by the district superintendent according to criteria specified by the Department of Education.

Presently, with the increasing teacher shortages throughout the nation, some states (Kentucky, Texas, Alabama) are planning to implement or have implemented similar scholarship and loan forgiveness programs. At the national level, federal legislation has been introduced to provide low-interest loans to college students who pursue degrees in mathematics or science and enter the teaching profession.

The Florida Department of Education plans to reintroduce a scholarship/loan program for prospective teachers in the 1983 session. The proposal initiates 50 scholarships in the first year and reaching a maximum of 200 after four years, reaching a total expenditure of $800,000. The Speaker's Task Force in Mathematics, Science and Computer Education in the Florida House of Representatives is also recommending a full-time scholarship/loan program for juniors and seniors preparing to teach science or mathematics.

The Task Force supports two types of scholarship programs which would encourage scholastically superior students to become teachers and also encourage students to pursue teaching careers in academic disciplines that are current or potential areas of critical shortage. In order to get more immediate rewards for the dollars invested in areas where there are critical shortages and also to provide double the number of scholarships for the same total allocation, the Task Force believes that 200 of these highly competitive scholarships of $4,000 each should not commence until the junior year. A second category of scholarships would provide 500 scholarships for tuition and books only, and would commence at the freshman level. The initial total cost for both scholarship programs is approximately $1,400,000.

B. Magnet Program for Talented Teachers

THE STATE SHOULD ESTABLISH AN INNOVATIVE PROGRAM AIMED AT RECRUITING BRIGHT, TALENTED, COMMITTED BACCALAUREATE GRADUATES TO TEACH IN FLORIDA MIDDLE AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS, PARTICULARLY IN AREAS OF CRITICAL SHORTAGE. ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA MUST CAREFULLY BE DELINEATED, INCLUDING:

-A SCORE ON THE GRADUATE RECORD EXAMINATION IN AT LEAST THE SEVENTIETH PERCENTILE
-EVIDENCE THAT CANDIDATES MEET THE SUBJECT AREA SPECIALIZATION REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTIFICATION
-EVIDENCE OF A STRONG DESIRE AND CAPABILITY FOR WORKING WITH STUDENTS
-SATISFACTORY COMPLETION OF ONE COURSE IN SOCIAL ASPECTS OF EDUCATION AND ONE COURSE IN METHODS AND LEARNING THEORY
-SATISFACTORY COMPLETION OF AN INTENSIVE CLINICAL-BASED INTERN PROGRAM DEVELOPED COOPERATIVELY BETWEEN SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND UNIVERSITIES FOR WHICH THE CANDIDATE MAY RECEIVE COMPENSATION FROM A SCHOOL BOARD.

UPON COMPLETION OF THE ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA, THESE TEACHERS WILL RECEIVE A TEMPORARY CERTIFICATE ENABLING THEM TO SERVE AS CLASSROOM TEACHERS FOR THREE YEARS IN FLORIDA PUBLIC SCHOOLS. THESE TEACHERS WOULD BE EXPECTED TO COMPLETE THE BEGINNING TEACHER PROGRAM. AFTER COMPLETING THE THREE YEAR REQUIREMENT, THESE INDIVIDUALS WOULD BE ENTITLED TO ONE YEAR OF TUITION-PAID COURSEWORK TOWARDS A MASTER'S DEGREE OF THEIR CHOICE.

Recognizing that large numbers of highly qualified and academically talented teachers are not being attracted to teacher education programs and are not staying in the profession, the Task Force saw a need to establish an experimental program to attract bright college and university graduates to teach in Florida's schools for a three year period. Great publicity has been given to data concerning the "shallow talent pool" of prospective teachers and reports that the most highly qualified teachers are the most likely to leave the profession early and in the greatest numbers. (See Chapter Four of this report). The Task Force concluded that given the proper incentives, many talented and bright college graduates, are interested in and capable of working with youth and could be recruited into Florida's classroom. The Task Force further concludes that if this program is to be successful, a number of factors must be recognized.

First, certification rules related to required coursework in education must be adapted to accommodate the ability of some highly qualified and interested persons who demonstrate a talent for teaching but are not graduates of a college of education.

Second, some amount of pedagogical training would be necessary before individuals not from a college of education could enter the classroom. This would include some coursework in pedagogical theory and an intensive, brief, clinically-based internship. Many educators are concerned that college graduates without a sufficient amount of professional training would find difficulty in trying to cope with a class full of disruptive students.

Third, this program should be limited to talented and academically bright graduates, and candidates should be required to demonstrate superior knowledge of the content area by an examination designated for that purpose.

Fourth, research indicates that a number of individuals look upon teaching as a transitional career and have little intention of staying in the profession. These individuals frequently view schools as places to serve society and as avenues to further explore knowledge of a subject area.

Fifth, the program must include incentives such as tuition-free graduate studies to offset low salaries and a possible delay in the individual's career development.

Sixth, the program must be of sufficient quality to insure that school administrators become interested in hiring these candidates.

Seventh, talented college of education graduates are also eligible to enter this program and would be exempt from the pedagogical requirements described above.

VI. ADDITIONAL INCENTIVES FOR TEACHERS IN AREAS OF CRITICAL SHORTAGES

THE TASK FORCE COMMENDS THE SPEAKER'S TASK FORCE ON MATH, SCIENCE, AND COMPUTER EDUCATION FOR DEVELOPING STRATEGIES TO ENSURE THAT FLORIDA WILL HAVE AN ADEQUATE SUPPLY OF TEACHERS IN THESE CRITICAL SHORTAGE AREAS. AREAS OF CRITICAL TEACHING SHORTAGES IN FLORIDA'S PUBLIC SCHOOLS SHOULD CONTINUE TO BE DETERMINED ANNUALLY BY THE EDUCATION STANDARDS COMMISSION.

The emerging areas of critical shortage in Florida are of concern to all teacher educators in Florida. As identified by the Education Standards Commission's study of manpower needs, this shortage is not limited to mathematics and science teachers alone. Vocational education, foreign language education, and elementary education are or will be experiencing shortages. Furthermore, fewer students are entering teacher education programs. When comparing enrollment data at the nine state universities, teacher education programs reported one-third fewer students in 1981 than they had in 1976. The problem is more acute with minority students entering the teaching profession.

Specific measures need to be taken to alleviate the teaching shortage in Florida. However, in so doing, the Task Force believes that teaching quality must be insured. The Task Force commends the Speaker's Task Force on Mathematics, Science and Computer Education for developing strategies to ensure that Florida will have an adequate supply of teaching in these critical shortage areas.

Business Tax Credits

THE STATE SHOULD AUTHORIZE PARTIAL BUSINESS TAX CREDITS TO PROMOTE THE INVOLVEMENT OF BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS FOR SUCH ACTIVITIES AS CONDUCTING TEACHER TRAINING WORKSHOPS AND TEACHING ADVANCED COURSES. HOWEVER, IN UTILIZING THESE CONTENT AREA SPECIALISTS AS ADJUNCT TEACHERS, PROVISIONS MUST BE MADE TO ENSURE THAT THESE INDIVIDUALS POSSESS ADEQUATE PEDAGOGICAL SKILLS.

Those seeking solutions to the problem of critical shortages in mathematics and science frequently cite the need for greater cooperation between the private sector and the public schools. Ideally, such a linkage would be advantageous to both sectors. Public schools would be offered the services of industrial employees skilled in technical, scientific, and mathematical skills, and the private sector would benefit in the future, since lack of skilled science teachers will result in a shortage of scientifically literate students for industry to hire. However, at both the national and state levels, efforts have been initiated to provide additional incentives to businesses to promote their involvement in public schools. This incentive takes the form of a business tax credit. At the state level, state corporate income tax credits would necessitate an amendment in Chapter 220. Partial industry and business tax credits could be provided to business for a wide variety of contributions to K-12 public education. The Speaker's Task Force on Mathematics, Science, and Computer Education developed a comprehensive list of contributions, including teaching in public schools, donating or loaning equipment, training science or mathematics teachers, developing curriculum materials, and sponsoring awards for outstanding teachers.

It is unwise to assume that a physicist, engineer, or another individual from the private sector has the appropriate skills to facilitate a positive learning environment. The Task Force therefore, wishes to emphasize that faculty recruited from business and industry need to be provided with some type of appropriate training and orientation to instructional strategies. Indeed, this would help ensure both the program's success and provide the adjunct teacher with a rewarding experience.

Summer Employment

THE STATE LEGISLATURE SHOULD PROVIDE ADDITIONAL FUNDS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS FOR SUMMER EMPLOYMENT IN THE FORM OF EXTENDED CONTRACTS FOR TEACHERS IN MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE AND ALSO IN OTHER CRITICAL SHORTAGE AREAS. THESE OPPORTUNITIES SHOULD INCLUDE UPGRADING NECESSARY KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS, DEVELOPING CURRICULUM MATERIALS, CONDUCTING TEACHER TRAINING INSTITUTES, TEACHING SUMMER SCHOOL STUDENTS IN ENRICHMENT OR REMEDIAL PROGRAMS, WORKING IN

BUSINESS/INDUSTRY, OR TAKING NECESSARY COURSEWORK TO ACQUIRE CERTIFICATION IN AREAS OF CRITICAL SHORTAGE.

Teachers' salaries are most often calculated on the basis of a ten month contract. In many cases, this ten month salary is not sufficient to support individual and family financial needs and many teachers are forced each year to seek summer employment. Unfortunately, challenging and well-paid summer employment is often not readily obtainable. The Task Force believes that guaranteed summer employment would be an attractive mechanism to retain the services of teachers in areas of critical shortage who either choose to or must supplement their regular income. Such an incentive could also be offered to retain currently employed teachers who may have had an undergraduate minor in a critical shortages area and who are now teaching in "surplus" fields. The Task Force wishes to note, however, that extension of ten month contracts will increase only the total number of dollars available to teachers and does nothing to increase the overall rate of pay -- a situation that must also be addressed and improved.

Summer Institutes

THE STATE LEGISLATURE SHOULD PROVIDE FOR SUMMER INSTITUTES TO UPGRADE THE KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS OF CERTIFIED SCIENCE, MATHEMATICS, AND OTHER TEACHERS IN CRITICAL SHORTAGE AREAS, AND ALSO TO RETRAIN CURRENT TEACHERS WHO ARE NOT CERTIFIED IN THESE AREAS. TEACHERS SELECTED TO PARTICIPATE SHOULD BE RECOMMENDED BY EACH SCHOOL DISTRICT BASED UPON NEED (INCLUDING SUCH FACTORS AS TEACHING OUT OF FIELD). FINANCIAL SUPPORT SHOULD COVER TUITION AND FEES, BOOKS, TRAVEL ALLOWANCES, FOOD, LODGING WHEN NECESSARY, AND A STIPEND. THE INSTITUTES SHOULD BE CAREFULLY MONITORED AND EVALUATED.

Quality inservice programs for mathematics and science teachers are essential. The explosion of new knowledge in these areas and the current critical shortages in the availability of mathematics and science teachers augment the need for rigorous teacher training and retraining programs. Ironically, the quality and quantity of inservice programs for mathematics and science teachers have decreased over the past several years. A major reason for this decline is that support of the National Science Foundation (NSF) for science and mathematics education has dropped significantly. Education's share of the total NSF budget has dropped from a high of 47 percent in 1959 to 2 percent in 1982. Gone are the days when the skills of science and to mathematics teachers were upgraded in summer institutes or academic year programs using these federal funds. A recent report of the National Science Teachers Association (Klein et al, 1982) stipulates that the "present cluster of national problems in secondary school science and mathematics education can in large part be attributed to NSF's negligence of the education component of their congressionally mandated mission (p. 7).

In Florida, state funds are earmarked for districts to use for inservice education. However, inservice dollars apply to all disciplines and frequently are absorbed to train teachers in a variety of legislatively-mandated programs. When quality training programs are offered to upgrade the knowledge and skills of science or mathematics teachers, they are usually limited to a few hours after school or on inservice days. Comprehensive, sequential training programs that continue over several days are virtually nonexistent.

In an attempt to alleviate this problem, the 1982 Legislature appropriated $300,000 for summer workshops to upgrade the skills of existing certified mathematics and science teachers and also to provide training for teachers of mathematics and science who are not certified in these areas. Unfortunately, these workshops were not planned in time for implementation during the summer of 1982 and the training is now being offered to approximately 550 teachers by state universities during the 1982-83 year. The Task Force believes a better coordinated program between school districts and universities is needed, and that summer institutes should be initiated.

VII. SUPPORT FOR PROSPECTIVE MINORITY TEACHERS

AS PART OF AN EFFORT TO ASSURE THAT QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS DO NOT DIMINISH THE INESTIMABLE VALUE OF DIVERSE FACULTIES, THE TASK FORCE RECOMMENDS THAT THE LEGISLATURE:

-APPROPRIATE FUNDS SUFFICIENT TO IMPLEMENT A PROGRAM FOR IMPROVING THE TEST TAKING SKILLS AND TEST AWARENESS OF MINORITIES AND THE ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED

-APPROPRIATE FUNDS FOR SCHOLARSHIPS TO ATTRACT ACADEMICALLY TALENTED AND HIGHLY MOTIVATED MINORITY AND ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS TO FULL-TIME TEACHING

-AUTHORIZE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A PROGRAM FOR ENCOURAGING MINORITIES WHO ARE MEMBERS OF PROFESSIONS OTHER THAN TEACHING TO SERVE IN THE SCHOOLS ON AN INTERMITTANT BASIS AS ADJUNCT FACULTY

-SUPPORT AND EXPAND THE EFFORTS OF FLORIDA A & M UNIVERSITY TO PREPARE STUDENTS FOR THE CLAST EXAMINATION, TEACHER CERTIFICATION EXAMINATION, AND OTHER STANDARDIZED TESTS IMPLEMENTED AS PART OF THE STATE'S QUALITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (SIMILAR PROGRAMS SHOULD BE SUPPORTED AT OTHER INSTITUTIONS BY CONTRACTUAL AGREEMENT)

-SUPPORT ESTABLISHMENT OF SUMMER OUTREACH PROGRAMS AND RESEARCH EFFORTS WHICH ARE DESIGNED TO UPGRADE SKILLS AND THE ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS IN COMMUNICATION SKILLS, COMPUTATION SKILLS, AND GENERAL CULTURAL ENRICHMENT ACTIVITIES.

The Task Force recognizes that Florida's efforts to improve the overall quality of teacher education must be accompanied by a rigorous, sustained effort to assure the racial and ethnic diversity of the state's teacher work force. This action is necessary because current data show that Florida's universities and teacher education programs are experiencing a decline in their black and other minority student populations, and this situation jeopardizes the availability of racial and ethnic minority teachers. Furthermore, it reduces opportunities for minority pupils to improve their academic achievements and skills. Data and presentations to the Task Force by Dr. Leedell Neyland and Chancellor Barbara Newell assert that the positive role model created by a minority teacher has a direct effect on academic achievement gains of minority students. Policies which result in a reduction in the availability of minority teachers will only serve to deprive minority students of these necessary role models. The Task Force believes that a more rigorous teacher certification examination, the CLAST program, and related "quality improvement" efforts must not adversely affect students who are economically disadvantaged or members of racial or ethnic minorities by depriving them of the benefit of school faculties in which blacks, Hispanics, and other minorities are adequately represented.

Finally, the Task Force wishes to endorse the popular belief that most black and other special population groups have special needs and agrees with the following statements by Florida's Postsecondary Education Planning Commission (PEPC) and the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) that recognize these special needs. PEPC in The Master Plan for Florida Postsecondary Education (1982) stated,

> Certain groups of people in Florida have unique, identifiable needs related to postsecondary education. As a result of social and economic disadvantages, some of Florida's population groups have special needs for remedial education, financial assistance, and flexible admissions policies and other specialized services (p. 6).

SREB in The Need for Quality (1981) stated:

> The commitment to quality for the 1980's must address the special needs of black students, many of whom have major deficiencies in academic skills. For example, at the college level, a response does not lie simply in denying admission to underprepared blacks, although higher admission standards may be in order over the long term. A permanent solution must involve curriculum reform at the secondary and college levels, with mandatory intensification of communication and quantitative coursework. To a considerable degree, the success of such reform depends on an adequate supply of highly qualified black teachers. Incentives are needed to attract high achievers among the black college students into teacher education programs (p. 3).

VIII. SALARY INCENTIVES

TEACHER SALARIES MUST BE INCREASED SIGNIFICANTLY TO MAKE TEACHING MORE COMPETITIVE WITH CAREERS IN PRIVATE INDUSTRY.

THE TASK FORCE SUPPORTS THE COMMITMENT IN THE STATE'S GOAL TO ACHIEVE THE UPPER QUARTILE IN TEACHER SALARIES BY 1985.

THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION SHOULD EVALUATE PROGRESS TOWARD THAT GOAL ANNUALLY AND KEEP THE PUBLIC AND THE LEGISLATURE INFORMED OF THAT PROGRESS.

The improvement of teacher education programs is a necessary but insufficient step toward insuring quality teaching in Florida classrooms. Financial incentives to attract and retain high quality teachers are also imperative. The Task Force's survey of teacher education faculty lists the recruitment of higher quality candidates as the number one recommendation for improving the quality of teacher education programs in Florida. This can only be accomplished if promising candidates view teaching as an attractive occupation with commensurate financial rewards.

It is no surprise that money is at the root of the problems both of attracting and retaining an adequate supply of skilled teachers. The returns on a student's investment in training to become a teacher are low in comparison with the financial rewards of a career in the private sector in which a similar amount of education is required. According to NEA, the average minimum starting salary of a teacher in the United States in the 1980-81 school year was $11,758, whereas the starting salary in the electronics industry could reach as high as $20,000 ("Status of the American," 1981).

Florida school districts vary in their starting salaries for new teachers with a bachelor's degree by as much as $3,600. In 1982-83, starting salaries for teachers with a bachelor's degree ranged from $14,229 in Dade County and $14,750 in Monroe County to lows of $11,128 in Franklin County and $11,500 in Flagler County. (A complete listing of the 1982-83 teacher salary ranges in Florida appears in Appendix F.) Furthermore, the range between the minimum and maximum salary is small. After a few years in the classroom, teachers are, in most cases at the top of their salary schedule, whereas employees in business and industry are generally at the mid-level of a much broader salary scale.

In addition, teachers have been losing ground to inflation over the past several years. Teacher salary schedules have fallen behind due to enrollment declines, reduction in federal funds, and state budget constraints. According to NEA estimates, teacher's salaries declined 12 percent in real purchasing power between 1971-72 and 1979-80 and the projections are believed to have accelerated since then (Guthrie and Zusman, 1982).

The Task Force strongly believes that for Florida to attract and retain individuals with high academic skills, there must be substantial improvements in teacher salaries. As a first step in recognition of this, the Task Force wishes to commend the State Board of Education for recognition of increased teacher salaries as a major prerequisite in making Florida "a state of educational distinction."

IX. PROMOTION AND SALARY CRITERIA FOR TEACHER EDUCATION FACULTY

COLLEGES OF EDUCATION AND UNIVERSITIES SHOULD BE STRONGLY ENCOURAGED BY THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION TO RECOGNIZE AND REWARD FACULTY WHO PROVIDE PROFESSIONAL PUBLIC SERVICE TO MEMBERS OF THE EDUCATIONAL COMMUNITY OF THE STATE. THE TASK FORCE BELIEVES IT IS EXTREMELY NECESSARY FOR THE HIGHER EDUCATION COMMUNITY TO UNDERSTAND THE VALUE OF THE SERVICES RENDERED BY COLLEGE OF EDUCATION FACULTY IN THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS OF THE STATE. TEACHING, RESEARCH AND SERVICE, ESPECIALLY SERVICE PROVIDED DIRECTLY TO THE SCHOOLS, SHOULD BE EQUALLY VALUED IN THE PROMOTION AND TENURE PROCESS.

The Task Force believes that regular and extensive experience in the classroom and with public schools is characteristic of competent teacher education faculty. Those faculty members must constantly refine their own instructional skills with K-12 students and must be aware of the realities of schools if they are to educate teachers effectively. To ensure this, the university must sanction, through salary, promotion, and other university reward policies, faculty time and energy spent in schools. Unfortunately the norms of universities both nationally and in Florida do not, as a rule, provide such official support. Preliminary results from the Task Force faculty survey suggest that of those faculty making recommendations for improving the process of promotion and tenure at their universities, 40 percent felt that the "service" component was undervalued presently in such decisions, and that it should be elevated to equal status with both the teaching and research components.

The problems related to equitable promotion and salary rewards for university faculty service to public schools are not new. Section 231.609(2), Florida Statutes, specifically states that "all appropriate faculty professional activities and services (to public schools) shall be recognized on the same basis as all other rewards, including salary and promotions, and for allocating faculty time for research, counseling, and all other non-teachers services". The Board of Regents, in a policy statement entitled "Strategies for Policy Improvement for the State University System of Florida" (1981), stated that "universities are requested to devise explicit criteria to be used for purposes of advancement and merit, which would be applied to university faculty assigned to outreach and service activities." In spite of these efforts, teacher faculty often perceive a disparity between rewards for public school service and more traditional research and teaching activities.

X. STRENGTHENING THE BACKGROUND FOR PROFESSIONAL TRAINING

A. Secondary School Curriculum for Teacher Candidates

THE TASK FORCE ENDORSES THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS FOR COLLEGE-BOUND STUDENTS AS SPECIFIED BY THE GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION ON SECONDARY SCHOOLS AND SUGGESTS THE FOLLOWING FOR THOSE INTERESTED IN PURSUING CAREERS IN TEACHING:

-FOUR YEARS OF ENGLISH
-FOUR YEARS OF MATHEMATICS INCLUDING MICROCOMPUTER LITERACY IN THE NINTH GRADE
-FOUR YEARS OF SCIENCE
-THREE YEARS OF SOCIAL SCIENCE INCLUDING ONE YEAR EACH OF AMERICAN HISTORY AND WORLD HISTORY, AS WELL AS ONE SEMESTER EACH IN ECONOMICS AND AMERICAN GOVERNMENT
-ONE SEMESTER OF PRACTICAL ARTS
-ONE SEMESTER OF FINE ARTS
-ONE SEMESTER OF PERSONAL HEALTH
-ONE SEMESTER OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION
-TWO YEARS OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE

What students know and the skills they possess at graduation must be increased at every level of education. The demands facing the citizens of tomorrow are so complex that we cannot expect to identify the specific knowledge and skills necessary for our children's success. What we do know, however, is that they must have faith in their ability to learn and in their individual and collective ability to control their own destiny. We also know that the teachers educating those students must possess skills and abilities which exceed those characteristic of teachers in the past.

A first step in upgrading the educational experience is to identify those areas of study which we believe to possess the greatest potential for facilitating continuous learning. The Governor's Commission on Secondary Schools has recently conducted an intensive study of this area and has recommended a curriculum for Florida high school students. In their report, the Commission suggested specific additional requirements for college-bound students in the areas of mathematics, science and foreign language. The Task Force strongly supports the requirements for college bound youth as necessary for those who wish to pursue careers in teaching. If we upgrade the education of students entering the professional study of teaching, we help assure that they, in turn, will upgrade the education they provide for their students.

B. Role and Scope of Community Colleges

COMMUNITY COLLEGES SHOULD CONTINUE AND BE FURTHER ENCOURAGED TO PROVIDE A STRONG AND COHERENT TWO YEAR

LOWER DIVISION UNDERGRADUATE LIBERAL ARTS AND/OR GENERAL EDUCATION FOR STUDENTS INTERESTED IN TRANSFERRING TO TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

COLLEGES OF EDUCATION SHOULD PROVIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE COUNSELORS WITH ATTRACTIVE, ACCURATE, AND TIMELY INFORMATION SO THAT STUDENTS CAN MAKE SOUND EDUCATIONAL AND CAREER DECISIONS. SUCH MATERIALS SHOULD INCLUDE INFORMATION ON JOB OPPORTUNITIES OR TRENDS, CHANGES IN CURRICULUM, AND A CLEAR STATEMENT OF THE KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND COMPETENCIES STUDENTS NEED TO BE WELL-PREPARED FOR TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

THE EDUCATION OF EFFECTIVE SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS TEACHERS IS PARTLY THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES WHICH OFFER THE LOWER DIVISION COURSES IN THESE AREAS. MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE FACULTY SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN APPROPRIATE IN-SERVICE EFFORTS.

THE ARTICULATION COORDINATING COMMITTEE SHOULD ESTABLISH A TASK FORCE OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM COMMUNITY COLLEGES, PUBLIC SCHOOLS, AND COLLEGES OF EDUCATION TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH INCLUDE:
-A REVIEW OF CERTIFICATION ISSUES AND PROBLEMS
-A DEFINITION OF THE ROLE AND SCOPE OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES INVOLVEMENT IN THE PRESERVICE AND INSERVICE TRAINING OF TEACHERS
-A REVIEW OF GENERAL EDUCATION AND SUBJECT MATTER OFFERINGS APPROPRIATE FOR PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS
-AN EXAMINATION OF THE FEASIBILITY AND TIMELINES OF SUPERVISED FIELD EXPERIENCES
-AN EXPLORATION OF FACULTY EXCHANGE OPPORTUNITIES BETWEEN COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND COLLEGES OF EDUCATION.

The primary responsibility of community colleges in Florida is to provide prospective college-bound youth with a quality lower division baccalaureate education and act as a springboard for the "2 + 2" transfer system to university study. The Task Force underscores the importance of strong undergraduate training in the professional development of prospective teachers. General education and a thorough command of basic skills provide the necessary foundation for subsequent professional training in pedagogy and in the substantive specialty and content areas of teaching.

The Task Force supports the findings and recommendations of the Speaker's Task Force on the Community College System, (Bell et al, 1983), particularly the recommendation calling for the establishment of appropriate academic standards both for placement in and exit from college parallel programs. Their report outlined several criteria which standards should meet. It stated:

> These standards should ensure that students have the ability to benefit from additional higher education before proceeding. Statewide standards for communications and computational skills should be established for students who seek placement in the college-parallel coursework at community colleges. These standards should reflect the appropriate levels of basic skills which are necessary for successful college work. Students should have to meet these standards before formally being accepted in college transfer courses (p. 9).

The relationship between community colleges and the state's teacher education programs is unclear and varies widely among institutions. For example, institutions such as the University of West Florida, Florida International University, the University of North Florida, and Florida Atlantic University, as expected, rely heavily on community college transfers. As a result, institutions located near these universities have substantial course offerings in teacher education. On the other hand, community colleges located near institutions which have had four year status for a long period have less developed teacher education programs.

According to data received from the Department of Education, 25 institutions out of 28 offer teacher education courses. The most common types of courses offered relates to the foundations of education, both social and psychological. All 25 institutions offer these courses. Additional offerings at community colleges include coursework in such disciplines as Exceptional Student Education, Early Childhood and Elementary Education, Mathematics Education, Science Education, Social Studies Education, English as a Second Language, Vocational Education, and Educational Technology. (For a complete list of courses and institutions, see Appendix G.)

The Task Force was unable to make a defined judgement on the qualifications of faculty assigned to teach these courses or on the quality of course content. It appears, however, that both are uneven and vary widely from institution to institution. The primary factor in this imbalance seems to be the amount of resources individual institutions commit to this area and the priority they assign it. Another factor seems to be the lack of substantive and sustained direction offered to community colleges by teacher education programs.

Students take teacher education courses in community colleges for two basic reasons. The most obvious is that they want to make careers as teachers and plan to study in teacher preparation programs when they transfer to a university. Second, and less obvious, is that many students holding baccalaureate degrees in non-education areas want to become certified to teach, and take those community college courses which will serve to meet the state's certification requirements--generally "Introduction to Education" and "Human Growth and Development." The Task Force was unable to determine what percentage of

students took education courses for "program" reasons and what percentage for "certification" reasons.

Task Force recommendations concerning requirements for an early field experience prior to admission to a teacher education program imply that community colleges will have to be further involved in teacher preparation. Since the extent of involvement and the level of quality seem to vary throughout the state, the Task Force recognizes that substantial planning and cooperation between public schools, universities, and community colleges must take place. The Task Force therefore suggests that the following questions at least be addressed by these groups in any effort to clarify and improve the role of community colleges in teacher education:

-To what extent and in what fashion should community colleges be involved in teacher education, if at all?
-Should community colleges be compelled to allocate scarce monetary and human resources to areas such as preparatory teacher education? Should additional funds be allocated to insure quality?
-How many students enroll in community college teacher education courses for certification purposes only? Is this factor in the best interest of preparing quality teachers for Florida's schools?
-Do community colleges assign qualified faculty to staff these courses?
-Are community colleges equipped to direct clinical and field experiences?

Finally, the Task Force believes that community colleges can help attract competent candidates for teacher preparation programs by providing students with information regarding career opportunities in teaching. Colleges of education should take leadership in providing this data to community college guidance counselors.

XI. IMPACT OF ADMINISTRATIVE LEADERSHIP

THE TASK FORCE ENDORSES CURRENT EFFORTS OF THE FLORIDA COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT TO UPGRADE AND IMPROVE THE IMPACT OF ADMINISTRATIVE LEADERS IN FLORIDA'S PUBLIC SCHOOLS. IN PARTICULAR IT SUPPORTS THE FOLLOWING:
-THE FLORIDA COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT SHOULD CONTINUE TO PROVIDE MANAGEMENT TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR PRINCIPALS.
-THE FLORIDA COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT SHOULD ASSESS THE QUALITY OF ALL LEVELS OF TRAINING (STATE, DISTRICT, UNIVERSITY) THROUGH WHICH PRINCIPALS WILL ACQUIRE THE VALIDATED COMPETENCIES.
-THE FLORIDA COUNCIL ON EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT SHOULD ENCOURAGE EFFECTIVE SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS AND UNIVERSITY FACULTY IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

PROGRAMS TO EVALUATE AND STRENGHTEN THEIR ADMINISTRATIVE TRAINING PROGRAMS IN LIGHT OF THE VALIDATED COMPETENCIES FOR PRINCIPALS AND THE DEVELOPING PROCESS OF COMPETENCY-BASED CERTIFICATION FOR ADMINISTRATORS.

Clearly quality educational leadership is a primary catalyst for the development of effective school relations, positive and productive teacher-student interaction, and superior educational performance on a school-wide basis. Research addressing the impact of educational leadership on quality teaching in public schools points consistently to several conclusions. Successful teaching environments and practices are shaped in planning, implementing, and evaluating educational programs. Effective administrators communicate their professional commitment to academic goals and instructional improvement, to staff, students, and the community, and clearly define a well-balanced set of objectives, evaluative criteria, and assessment procedures. The literature suggests that administrative professionals who embody these characteristics and competencies have greatest success in attracting and retaining quality teachers. In short, the impact of strong, effective school leaders extends far beyond their direct contact with students and teachers. It affects school operations, directions, and practices at a much deeper level, providing the support and direction for an environment of positive educational growth.

Since 1980, Florida has developed substantial legislative policy which recognizes and furthers the relationship between quality school administrators, quality teachers, and student success in Florida's schools. Motivated by the assertion that "quality education in the public schools of the state requires excellence in its principals and other managers" (Section 231.87, F.S.), the Florida Council on Educational Management was established. Mandated to provide leadership and funds to support a comprehensive program for developing, implementing, and maintaining competent management practices and performance in schools, the Council has produced a taxonomy of successful administrative competencies and a methodology for cross-validating and assessing the reliability of such competencies across school settings.

A comprehensive management development and training program for educational managers was created by the Management Training Act of 1981 and placed under the aegis of the Council. More recently, as part of the ongoing, sustained commitment to enhance the professional skills of administrators, the legislature further strengthened the requirements of Section 231.29, Florida Statutues, by requesting school boards to provide training, when necessary, for management personnel in the proper use of proven evaluative and assessment techniques. Thus both local and state-level resources have been marshalled in support of administrative excellence.

The Task Force strongly supports these legislative efforts designed to enhance the level of school leadership. The Florida Council for Educational Management's past work and present direction suggests an enduring commitment to provide support for quality teaching by insuring

high-performance school management, purposeful educational guidance, and instructional leadership. Effective educational leadership relates to all aspects of preservice and inservice teacher education programs. Thus, improvements in the quality of teaching and teacher education programs require the support and involvement of quality school administrators.

XII. ANALYZING THE WORKPLACE

SINCE IMPROVEMENTS IN THE WORKPLACE ARE CRITICAL TO THE RETENTION OF HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS, IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT A STUDY BE COMMISSIONED IMMEDIATELY TO EXAMINE THE WORKPLACE AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO WHY TEACHERS LEAVE THE CLASSROOM AFTER A FEW SHORT YEARS. FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED SHOULD INCLUDE PEER AND PUBLIC RECOGNITION, CLASSROOM CLIMATE, ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT, COMPENSATION, INVOLVEMENT IN THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS, THE ROLE OF INSERVICE EDUCATION, AND LACK OF CAREER LADDER.

The Task Force believes that significant efforts to recruit quality teachers will only prove fruitful when schools provide an attractive work environment for teachers and the profession is able to retain them for a long-term career. Several studies have shown that many talented teachers leave teaching after only a few years of service because of dissatisfaction with their workplace. Vance and Schlechty, in their paper entitled Research on Teaching: Implications for Practice (1982), clearly defined this problem when they stated,

> It is probable that the reason past efforts to improve the academic quality of the teaching corps have failed is because these efforts have concentrated primarily on recruiting more able people to teacher education and on changing the quality of teacher education programs themselves rather than attending to the structuring of schools in ways that would be attractive to these increasingly able candidates. The ability to recruit academically able teachers depends in large measure on the ability of schools to provide environments and career opportunities that are attractive to the academically able in the first place (p. 36).

The research cites several factors about the workplace which negatively affect the retention of talented teachers in the classroom. First, the teaching profession has no career ladder and is, for the most part, undifferentiated. Therefore there is little opportunity for advancement if a teacher chooses to remain in the classroom. A teacher's salary generally peaks after 10 or 15 years. Second, there is little reward for continued professional development and the attempt to excel in teaching. Quality teachers seldom receive recognition or

rewards from their peers, administrators, or the public in general. Third, the management structure of a school is often very bureaucratic--administrators tend not to be effective instructional leaders and teachers are not offered appropriate opportunities for shared-decision making.

An investigation of factors inherent in the workplace is essential if policy makers are to be provided with the data necessary to take corrective action and further the state's commitment to educational quality. The Task Force believes that a study should be undertaken immediately to examine the workplace, analyze why it is not conducive to retaining talented career-oriented men and women, and to develop recommendations for improvements which can be made in the school environment and the teacher's profession.

XIII. PUBLIC INFORMATION CAMPAIGN

GIVEN THE NEED FOR QUALITY TEACHERS AND THE NEED TO COUNTER MISPERCEPTIONS ABOUT TEACHER SURPLUS, IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION DEVELOP A PUBLIC INFORMATION CAMPAIGN TO HIGHLIGHT THE IMPORTANCE OF TEACHERS AND TEACHING TO FLORIDA'S EDUCATIONAL FUTURE, INFORM THE PUBLIC OF THE CHALLENGES AND REWARDS OF TEACHING, PROMOTE THE RECRUITMENT OF HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHER EDUCATION CANDIDATES INTO THE AREAS OF CRITICAL TEACHER SHORTAGE, AND PUBLICIZE THE AVAILABILITY OF TEACHER SCHOLARSHIP/LOANS.

THIS PUBLIC INFORMATION CAMPAIGN SHOULD CALL ATTENTION TO THE SUPERIOR PERFORMANCES OF TEACHERS PRESENTLY IN THE FIELD AND PROVIDE A STATEWIDE EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING AWARD TO THE OUTSTANDING INDIVIDUAL IN FLORIDA. THIS AWARD SHOULD BE GIVEN TO THAT TEACHER, SELECTED BY FACULTY, ADMINISTRATION, AND THE PUBLIC, WHO MOST REFLECTS THE DEDICATION AND EXCELLENCE REPRESENTATIVE OF QUALITY TEACHING PERFORMANCE. FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS SHOULD BE AWARDED TO THE STATE'S OUTSTANDING TEACHER, $2,000 TO EACH OF THE RUNNER-UPS, AND $1,000 TO EACH DISTRICT'S NOMINEE.

FUTURE TEACHERS OF AMERICA CLUBS SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED AND REDEVELOPED IN LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS TO PROVIDE SECONDARY AND MIDDLE SCHOOL STUDENTS WITH INFORMATION REGARDING THE CAREER OF TEACHING AND THE OPPORTUNITY TO PRACTICE WORKING WITH STUDENTS.

There is little doubt that public faith in the quality of classroom teachers has been called into question over the last few years. The perception has spread that this faithful public servant -- once honored

and respected in the community — is presently less qualified and competent, and not capable of educating the youth of today. More than slightly tarnished, the public image of teachers has begun to corrode.

Traditional American folk wisdom has been uniquely ambivalent in its characterization of the school teacher. On one extreme, the teacher has been viewed as hardworking, educated, usually underpaid, but diligently dedicated to imparting those fundamental and incalculable skills students have needed to cope in an ever-changing world. Alternatively, the American school teacher has been cast as a misfit. From the early Ichabod Crane to the image of the prissy spinster school teacher, the familiar stock figures of teachers have endured their share of ridicule. The massive feminization of the occupation at the turn of the century forced the status of the occupation into an increasingly unique, yet uncertain, position. In general, teachers have never been accorded the status of the established professions (law, medicine, etc.) but have been held in the public esteem occupationally somewhere between the clergy and skilled artisans.

While most parents encourage their children to respect teachers, historically this respect has been long on rhetoric and short in practice and has had the effect of polarizing feelings about educators and education. As a NEA official has echoed, "Americans value education, but they have never valued teachers" (Benderson, 1982).

Improving the public image of teaching lies at the heart of any effort to improve the educational climate in the public schools. Targeting the most effective and expeditious point at which to intervene to affect the public image of teachers will require an honest estimate both of the fundamental dynamics of the teaching profession and the feasibility of strategies directed toward enhancing the attractiveness of the occupation. Serious attempts to alter this image must consider several important factors.

First, reform attempts must grow out of an understanding of both the day-to-day and career-long concerns and realities of those who work within the profession. We must take a long hard look at the structure of the occupation of teaching in Florida and the way teaching fits into the larger occupational landscape. Large numbers of quality recruits to teaching will not be attracted to programs, regardless of their excellence, if the reward structure of this type of career investment is persistently undervalued in society.

Second, serious effort must be made to fund a system of training and practice at a level of excellence commensurate with university visions and expectations.

Third, it must be remembered that the entire structure of the educational system in the state exists, in effect, as a support system for teachers in the field, providing them with the technical, physical, and professional resources that will allow them to do the best job possible. To do this, we must make conspicuous demonstrations of the value we place on teachers' efforts. Teaching today is more demanding than ever; we must be committed to showing our support for those who

meet this challenge with creativity, dedication, and the desire to motivate students personally and academically. We must make statewide efforts to highlight the scope of quality teaching throughout Florida's public schools as a complement to reform strategies directed toward improving the quality of teacher education programs.

CHAPTER SEVEN

CONCLUSION

The process of improving the quality of teacher education in Florida is not one which has its beginning or ending in a single report. Instead, it must be a continuing endeavor in need of constant reassessment. The Task Force urges that this report not be set aside on the shelf and referenced as an interesting document. Instead, it hopes that the report will provide the basis for legislative and policy change in teacher education.

The Task Force believes that in the past few months it has addressed the charge of the Legislature comprehensively and systematicly and offered a variety of strategies for fundamental improvement. Whereas the Task Force membership represented diverse interests from throughout Florida, the group was held together by the common, clearly stated objective of improving the quality of teacher education in the state. Accordingly, the group developed recommendations under the constraints of time and membership diversity.

The Task Force report deals with the future of Florida. No single profession has more direct bearing on the ability to cope with the complex, dynamically changing society than does the teaching profession. The report contains many specific recommendations for improving teaching and teacher education in Florida. It calls on several policy-making bodies--the State Board of Education, the Legislature, the Board of Regents, the Department of Education, the Education Standards Commission, and others to act cooperatively to strengthen teacher education programs and standards.

While the Task Force does not wish to devalue teachers educated out of state, it does recognize that it is only within state programs that high preservice standards and the development of new teachers specifically educated to meet the needs of Florida students can be ensured. With this in mind, the Task Force calls on the State Board of Education to establish as a policy goal that by 1986, Florida institutions will produce at least 50 percent of the teachers needed each year to staff Florida schools.

Finally, the Task Force urges that significant measures be taken to upgrade teaching and teacher education. It hopes that Florida will use these recommendations as the basis on which to establish a position of leadership among the states in quality teacher education programs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adler, M. The paedeia proposal. New York: Collier MacMillan, 1982.

Alexander, L. Better schools program: Tennessee master teacher program. (Summary of Governor Alexander's state of education address to the Tennessee Press Association). Nashville, Tennessee: Department of Education, 1983.

Andrew, M.D. The characteristics of students in a five year teacher education program. Journal of Teacher Education, 1983, 34(1), 20-23.

Andrews, T.E. Current issues in teacher education: From a state perspective. Chelmsford, Massachusetts: Northeast Regional Exchange, 1982.

Appignani, G. (Ed.) Policy for the education of educators: Issues and implications. Washington: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1981.

Arnold, D.S., et al. Quality control in teacher education: Some policy issues. Washington: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1977.

Atkin, J. Teacher supply/demand 1982: A report based upon an opinion survey of teacher placement officers. Madison Wisconsin: Association for School, College, and University Staffing, 1982.

Backman, C.A. Imperatives for teacher education: Immediate and future. Reprinted from Robinson newsletter at the Universtiy of West Florida, 1982, 8.

Bell, S.P., et al. Report and recommendations of the Speaker's task force on the Community College System, Tallahassee: Florida House of Representatives, 1983.

Berg, I., et al. Report of a blue ribbon panel on teacher education. Trenton: New Jersey Department of Higher Education, 1981.

Benderson, A. Teacher competence. Focus, 1982, 10.

Bloland, P.A., and Selby, T.J. Factors associated with career change among secondary school teachers: A review of the literature. Educational Research Quarterly, 1980, 5, 13-24.

Carbone, P. Liberal Education and Teacher Preparation, Journal of Teacher Education, 1980, 31(3), 13-17.

Clark, D.L. and Egon, G.G. A study of teacher education institutions as innovators, knowledge producers, and change agencies. Washington: National Institute of Education, (1977 Project No. 4-0752).

Coalition for the Development of a Performance Evaluation System. Handbook of the Florida performance measurement system. Tallahassee: Florida Department of Education, 1982.

Commission on the Education of Teachers of Mathematics. Guidelines for the preparation of teachers of mathematics, Washington: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 1981.

Conant, J.B. The education of American teachers. New York: McGraw Hill, 1963.

Corrigan, D. Can we achieve quality in teacher education? A state and national perspective. College Station: Texas A & M University, 1981.

Corrigan, D. Quality in teaching and teacher education. President's Address delivered at the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Annual Conference, 1982.

Cremin, L.A. "The education of the educating professions." The knowledge base for the preparation of educational personnel. 1978, 5-24.

Cronin, J.M. State regulation of teacher preparation. Boston: Massachusetts Higher Education Assistance Committee, 1981.

Dearman, N.B., and Pkisko, V.W. The condition of education, 1982 edition, a statistical report: National Commission on Educational Statistics. Washington: United States Department of Education, 1982.

Denemark, G., et al. Educating a profession: Profile of a beginning teacher. Paper presented at American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Meeting, Washington, 1982.

Denemark, G., and Nutter, N. The case for extended programs of initial teacher preparation. Washington: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1980.

Dreeben, R.S. The nature of teaching. Glenview, Illinois: Scott-Foresman, 1970.

Ducharme, E.R. Faculty development in schools, colleges, and departments of education. Journal of Teacher Education, 1981, 12(5), 30-34.

Elsbree, W.S. The American teacher. New York: American Book, 1939.

Florida Council on Educational Management. Management training act and the Florida council on educational management: Status report to the House Education Committee K-12. Tallahassee, Florida: Author, 1981.

Florida Council on Educational Management. Guidelines for school district management training programs. Tallahassee; Florida: Author, 1982.

Florida Department of Education. Florida teacher education programs. Tallahassee; Florida: Office of Teacher Education, 1982.

Freeman, B. The decade: A review of the Austin teacher program. Sherman, Texas: Austin College Teacher Education Department, 1981.

Freeman, L.D. State interest, certification, and teacher education program approval, Legal Issues in Teacher Preparation & Certification, 1980.

Gallegos, A.M. Politics & realities of staff development. Journal of Teacher Education, 1980, 31(1), 21-24.

Gant, J.L. Module for: Personnel administration and tenure. Paper presented at the meeting of American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, 1982.

Gideonse, H.D. and Koff, R.H. Inquiry, scholarship, and teacher education: Issues and implications. Paper presented at American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, 1982.

Guthrie, J.A., and Zusman, A. Teacher supply and demand in mathematics and science. Phi Delta Kappan, 1982, 64(1), 28-33.

Haberman, M. The legacy of teacher education: 1980 - 2000. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Houston, 1981.) (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 212 575.)

Hall, G., et al. Exploring issues in teacher education: Questions for future research. Austin; Texas: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1980.

Heald, J. Report to the profession. Washington: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1982.

Help! Teacher can't teach. Time, June 16, 1980, 54-63.

Howsam, R.B., et al. Educating a profession: Report of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education bicentennial commission in education for the profession of teaching. Washington: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1976.

Howsam, R.B. The Future of teacher education, Journal of Teacher Education, 1982, 33(4), 2-7.

Hord, S.M. and Adams, R.D. (Eds.). Teacher education program evaluation, 1981: Theory and practice. Austin, Texas: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1981.

Hufker, R. SCDEs as leaders in faculty development. Journal of Teacher Education, 1980, 31(1), 16-20.

Imig, D.G. An examination of the teacher education score: An overview of the structure and form of teacher education. Washington: United States Department of Education, 1982.

Johnson, J.V., et al. The commission to study teacher preparation programs in New Jersey: Final report. Trenton: State of New Jersey , 1981.

Judge, H. American graduate schools of education: A view from abroad. New York: The Ford Foundation, 1982.

Katzenmeyer, W. Performance of USF graduates above and below the 40th percentile on the Florida teacher certification examination. Unpublished paper, University of South Florida, 1982.

Kennedy, D. Advancing knowledge. Paper presented at the meeting of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1981.

Kentucky Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Data relevant to state board of education consideration of assessing teacher competencies for entry into preparation programs. Frankfort, Kentucky: Author, 1981.

Kleine, P.F., and Wisniewski, R. Bill 1706: A forward step for Oklahoma. Phi Delta Kappan, 1981, 63(2), 115-117.

Knight, P.J. Who shall control entry into teacher education? Raleigh, North Carolina: North Carolina Quality Assurance Program, 1981. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 209 225)

Koerner, J.D. The miseducation of American teachers. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1963.

Lake, D.G., et al. Council on educational management: Review of literature and resources on high-performing principals. Tallahassee: Florida Department of Education, 1981.

Larson, R., Chairman A statement on the preparation of teachers of English and the language arts. Washington: National Council of Teachers of English, 1974.

Lortie, D. Schoolteacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Lyons, G. Why teachers can't teach. Phi Delta Kappan, 1980, 62(2), 108-112.

Mechling, K., Chairman Recommended standards for the preparation and certification of teachers of science at the elementary and middle/junior high school levels. Washington: National Science Teachers Association, 1982.

Medley, D. Teacher competency testing and the teacher educator. Charlottesville, Virginia: Association of Teacher Educators and the Bureau of Educational Research, 1982.

Mitchell, R. The graves of academe. Boston: Little Brown, 1981.

Monahan, W., et al. Educating a profession: Extended programs of teacher education. Washington: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1982.

Nolan, J.F. Professional laboratory experiences: The missing link in teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 33(4), 1982, 49-54.

O'Connell, W.R. and Smartt, S.H. Improving faculty evaluation: A trial in strategy. Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Regional Education Board, 1979.

Pavalko, R.M. Recruitment to teaching: Patterns of selection and retention. Sociology of education, 1976, 43, 340-355.

Peseau, B., and Orr, P. The outrageous underfunding of teacher education. Phi Delta Kappan, 1980, 62(2), 100-102.

Peseau, B. Fifth annual academic production and funding study of teacher education programs in senior state university & land-grant colleges 1981-82. Tuscaloosa, Alabama: University of Alabama, 1982.

Peseau, B. Developing an adequate resource base for teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 33(4), 1982, 13-15.

Postsecondary Education Planning Commission. The master plan for Florida postsecondary education: Report & recommendations of the Postsecondary Education Planning Commission, Tallahassee, Florida: Author, 1982.

Rauth, M. Statement of the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, on teacher education and retention. Paper presented to the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, United States House of Representatives, 1981.

Roberts, D. Arkansas program for effective teaching: Guidelines and procedures for implementing the program for effective teaching - "PET." Little Rock, Arkansas: Department of Education, 1981.

Robinson, S., et al. Excellence in our schools, teacher education: An action plan. Washington: National Education Association, 1982.

Scannell, D. Teacher education: What it could and should become. Paper presented for Conference on Quality in Teacher Education and Personnel Preparation for Education of the Handicapped, 1980.

Scannell, D., and Guenther, J. The development of an extended program. Journal of Teacher Education, 1981, 32(1), 7-12.

Scannell, D., et al. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education position paper on extended programs. Washington: Author, 1982.

Scanlon, R.G., Rites, W. and Simons, L. Report of the Chief State School Officers ad hoc committee on teacher certification, preparation, and accreditation. Paper presented at the meeting of the Forum of Educational Organization Leaders, 1982.

Schlechty, P., and Vance, V. Do academically able teachers leave education? The North Carolina case. Phi Delta Kappan, 1981, 63(2), 106-112.

Schlechty, P., and Vance, V. Recruitment, selection, and retention: The shape of the teaching force. Paper presented at the National Institute of Education Airlee House Conference on the Implications of Research on Teaching for Practice, 1982.

Simmons, L., and Sweatt, T.J. Survey of teacher education requirements in 11 southern states. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Houston, 1982.

Smelser, N.J., et al. Report of the commission of education. Unpublished paper, University of California at Berkeley, 1981.

Smith, A. Return to education. Transcript of interview of Mortimer Adler by William F. Buckley, Jr., Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Educational Communicators Association, 1982.

Smith, D., and Street, S. The professional component in selected professions. Phi Delta Kappan, 1980, 62(2), 103-107.

Smith, B.O. Pedagogical education: How about reform? Phi Delta Kappan, 1980, 62(2), 87-91.

Smith, B.O., et al. A design for a school of pedagogy. Washington: United States Department of Education, 1981.

The state of teacher education. Washington: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1982.

Status of the American public school teacher, 1980-81. Washington: National Education Association, 1981

Steinacher, R.C. The five year, non-traditional Austin teacher program: Preparing teachers for the 21st century. Sherman, Texas: Austin College, 1981.

Sykes, W.G., et al. Draft recommendations of the commission on quality teaching. Baltimore, Maryland: State Board of Education, 1982.

Task Force on Higher Education and the Schools. The need for quality: A report to the Southern Regional Education Board by its task force on higher education and the schools. Atlanta, Georgia: Author, 1981.

Teacher education at the University of New Hampshire. Durham, New Hampshire: Author, 1981.

Teachers for Florida schools personnel projections. Tallahassee, Florida: Education Standards Commission, 1981.

Toch, T. Number of blacks entering teaching declines dramatically. Education Week, March 3, 1982, 14, 1.

Vance, V., and Schlechty, P. The distribution of academic ability in the teaching force: Policy implications. Phi Delta Kappan, 1982, 64(1), 22-27.

Vance, V., and Schlechty, P. The structure of the teaching occupation and the characteristics of teachers: A sociological interpretation. Washington: National Institute of Education, 1982.

Weaver, W.T. Educators in supply and demand: Effects on quality. School Review, 1978, 86(4), 552-593.

Weaver, W.T. In search of quality - need for talent in teaching. Phi Delta Kappan, 1979, 61(1), 29-32; 46.

Weaver, W.T. The talent pool in teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 1981, 32(3), 32-36.

What teachers are paid. USA Today, September 29, 1982, 2a-3.

Wheeler, C.W. NCATE: Does it matter? East Lansing, Michigan: Institute for Research on Teaching, 1980.

Wisniewski, R. Three scenarios for teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 1982, 32(2), 2-6.

Witty, E.P. Prospects for black teachers: Preparation, certification, employment. Washington: ERIC/SP, 1982.

Wolf, W. Teacher drop-outs: A professional lament. In A.C. Riccio and F. Cyphert (Eds.), Teaching in America. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1962.

Appendix A

TASK FORCE MEETING
AGENDAS

AGENDA

JOINT EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE TASK FORCE
FOR TEACHER EDUCATION QUALITY IMPROVEMENT

Monday, August 30, 1982 -- 9:00 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.
Morris Hall, House Office Building (Room 21)
Tallahassee, Florida

I. Call to Order and Determination of Quorum — 9:00 a.m.

II. Welcome
- Governor Bob Graham

III. Opening Remarks
- Dr. David Spence - Executive Director, Postsecondary Education Planning Commission

IV. Related Studies and Activities — 10:00 a.m.

A. Southern Regional Education Board Task Force on Higher Education and the Schools - Final Recommendations
- Kenneth H. MacKay, Jr. - Task Force Chairman

B. K-12/Postsecondary Education Cooperation - Postsecondary Education Planning Commission Final Report
- Dr. Michael Armstrong

C. Institute of Education - Status Report
- Dr. Andrew Robinson

D. Teacher Education Centers - Joint Legislative Oversight Study
- Neal Berger, Michael O'Farrell

--- LUNCH BREAK ---

E. Teacher Education Center Study (Education Standards Commission) - Status Report — 1:00 p.m.
- Dr. Richard Holihan

F. Office of Teacher Education, Certification, and Staff Development - Status Report
- Dr. Garfield Wilson

V. Task Force Organizational Business — 2:30 p.m.

A. Elect Chairman

B. Establish Meeting Dates and Locations

C. Devise Study Outline

VI. Announcements and Miscellaneous

VII. Adjournment — 4:00 p.m.

Agenda

JOINT EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE TASK FORCE
FOR TEACHER EDUCATION QUALITY IMPROVEMENT

Monday, September 27, 1982 -- 9:00 a.m.
Salon E, Tampa Marriott Hotel
Tampa, Florida

I.	Call to Order, Review of Minutes, Review of Agenda	9:00 a.m.
II.	Opening Remarks - Dr. Armando Henriquez, Chairman, Task Force	9:15 a.m.
III.	Membership discussion regarding the Task Force's charge from their perspective	9:30 a.m.
	--- BREAK ---	10:30 a.m.
IV.	Organizational Activities	10:45 a.m.

A. Areas of Interest Survey-Staff report
B. Taxonomy
C. Selection of Vice-Chairmen
D. Study Panel identification and assignment
E. Assignment of future meeting dates

	--- LUNCH BREAK ---	11:50 a.m.
V.	Presentation: Florida Management Council - Associate Deputy Commissioner, Cecil Golden	1:00 p.m.
VI.	Presentation: Florida Association of Teacher Educators, Report on discussion of Task Force - Lynn Gold and Jeffrey Hoffman	1:45 p.m.
VII.	Presentation: Summary of activities of Maryland Commission on the Improvements of Teacher Quality and Commission on Education, University of California at Berkeley - Staff	2:05 p.m.
	--- BREAK ---	2:50 p.m.
VIII.	Study Panels meet to organize	3:00 p.m.
IX.	Summary and Adjournment	4:15 p.m.

Agenda

JOINT EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE TASK FORCE
FOR TEACHER EDUCATION QUALITY IMPROVEMENT

Monday, October 18, 1982 -- 8:30 a.m. - 3:45 p.m.
Duval Room, Host International Hotel
Tampa, Florida

I.	Call to Order, Review of Minutes, Review of Agenda	8:30 a.m.
II.	Review of the October 6th Meeting with Legislative Staff - Rick Alterman	8:40 a.m.
III.	Teacher Education Program Approval Process	9:00 a.m.
	A. Dr. Fred Milton, Florida Department of Education B. Dr. Sue Freedman, Task Force Staff	
	--- BREAK ---	
IV.	Teachers for Florida Schools Personnel Projections and Recommendations regarding Selection Standards - Education Standards Commission	10:00 a.m.
V.	Funding Universities and Colleges of Education - Dr. Carl Blackwell, Director of Budgets, State University System	10:30 a.m.
VI.	Teacher Education Programs: An Analysis and Prescription - Professor B.O. Smith	11:15 a.m.
	--- LUNCH BREAK ---	12:15 p.m.
VII.	Study Panel Reports	1:15 p.m.
	A. Dean David Smith B. Father James McCartney C. Dean Bill Katzenmeyer	
VIII.	Study Panel Meetings	1:30 p.m.
	A. Discuss conceptual issues needed to be examined; B. Organize frameworks to carry out examination; C. Assign tasks to staff and membership; D. Decide on future committee meetings; E. Plan future agendas; F. Identify future meeting sites.	
IX.	Full Task Force meets to discuss future agenda	3:15 p.m.
X.	Adjournment	3:45 p.m.

Agenda

JOINT EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE TASK FORCE
FOR TEACHER EDUCATION QUALITY IMPROVEMENT

Wednesday, November 10, 1982 -- 8:30 a.m. - 3:45 p.m.
Boca Ciega Bay Room, Admiral Benbow Hotel
Tampa, Florida

I.	Call to Order, Review Minutes, Review Agenda, Staff Update	8:30 a.m.
II.	Developments in Teacher Education: The Case for Extended Programs - Dean Dale Scannell, School of Education, University of Kansas	8:45 a.m.
III.	Education as a Developing Profession - Professor Robert B. Howsam, University of Houston	9:30 a.m.
	--- BREAK ---	
IV.	Major Governance, Funding, and Staff Development Policy Issues in Teacher Preparation Programs - Professor Jack Gant, President, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) and Dean, College of Education, Florida State University	10:30 a.m.
V.	Teacher Preparation in a Private Institution of Higher Education - Dean Lou Kleinman, School of Education, University of Miami	11:15 a.m.
	---LUNCH ---	
VI.	Comments and Observations on Improving Florida's Teacher Education Programs - Senator Jack Gordon	1:15 p.m.
VII.	Committee Meetings	2:00 p.m.
VIII.	Committee Reports Program - David Smith Personnel - Father James McCartney Governance - Bill Katzenmeyer	3:15 p.m.
IX.	General Wrap-up and Future Meetings	3:30 p.m.
X.	Adjournment	3:45 p.m.

Agenda

JOINT EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE TASK FORCE
FOR TEACHER EDUCATION QUALITY IMPROVEMENT

Sunday, December 5, 1982 -- 5:00 p.m. - 7:00 p.m.
Monday, December 6, 1982 -- 8:30 a.m. - 3:45 p.m.
Duval Room, Host International Hotel
Tampa, Florida

December 5, 1982

I.	Task Force discussion of preliminary recommendations	5:00 p.m.

December 6, 1982

I.	Call to order, review of minutes, staff update	8:30 a.m.
II.	Teacher Education Programs: The Arts and Science Perspective Dean James Strange, College of Arts and Letters, University of South Florida	8:45 a.m.
III.	Governance, Funding and Teacher Preparation Programs: A University-wide Perspective	9:25 a.m.
	A. Dr. Steve Altman, Vice-President of Academic Affairs, Florida International University	
	B. Dr. Robert Bryan, Vice-President of Academic Affairs, University of Florida	
	--- BREAK ---	10:50 a.m.
IV.	Teacher Education Programs: Perspectives from Florida's Teachers Unions	11:00 a.m.
	A. Mr. Cy Wingrove, President, FTP-NEA	
	B. Mr. James Geiger, First Vice-President, FEA-UNITED	
	--- LUNCH ---	12:15 p.m.
V.	Update on Issue #5: "Differential Funding for Colleges of Education", Dr. Bruce Peseau	1:15 p.m.
VI.	Committee meetings	1:30 p.m.
VII.	Committee reports	2:15 p.m.
VIII.	General Discussion - Full Task Force	2:30 p.m.
IX.	Adjournment	3:45 p.m.

Agenda

JOINT EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE TASK FORCE
FOR TEACHER EDUCATION QUALITY IMPROVEMENT

Thursday, January 6, 1983 -- 1:00 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.
Friday, January 7, 1983 -- 8:30 a.m. - 3:15 p.m.
415 House Office Building
Tallahassee, Florida

January 6

I.	Call to Order, Review of Minutes, Staff Update	1:00 p.m.
II.	General Membership Discussion	
	A. Outline of Report	
	B. List of Concerns	
	C. Issue Matrix	
	D. Expanded Drafts of 13 Approved Concepts	
	E. New Concepts Developed by Writing Committee	
	F. Introduction of concepts from Individual Members	
III.	Adjournment	5:00 p.m.
IV.	Optional Committee Meetings	7:00 p.m.

January 7

I.	Call to Order	8:30 a.m.
II.	General Membership Discussion Continued	8:45 a.m.
III.	Discussion of Future Task Force Meetings	11:30 a.m.
	--- LUNCH ---	
IV.	Dr. Barbara W. Newell, Chancellor, State University System of Florida	1:00 p.m.
V.	Dr. Leedell Neyland, Vice President of Academic Affairs and Dean, College of Humanities and Social Science	1:30 p.m.
VI.	Dr. William L. Proctor, President, Flagler College, Representing The Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida	2:00 p.m.
VII.	Open Discussion	2:30 p.m.
VIII.	Adjournment	3:15 p.m.

Agenda

JOINT EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE TASK FORCE
FOR TEACHER EDUCATION QUALITY IMPROVEMENT

Wednesday, January 26, 1983 -- 1:00 p.m. - 7:00 p.m.
Thursday, January 27, 1983 -- 8:30 a.m. - 3:15 p.m.
16 House Office Building
Tallahassee, Florida

January 26th

I. Call to Order, Review of Minutes — 1:00 p.m.

II. Report and Discussion of "Differential Funding for Colleges of Education", Dr. Bruce Peseau — 1:10 p.m.

III. Staff Update — 1:55 p.m.

IV. General Membership Discussion — 2:25 p.m.
- A. Revised Recommendations
  1. Improving Teacher Education Programs
  2. Strengthening Florida's Teacher Certification Exam
  3. University Commitment to Teacher Education
  4. Scholarships
- B. New Recommendations
  1. Recognition and Certification of Teachers of Excellence
  2. The Impact of Administrative Leadership
  3. Teacher Education Program Admission's Requirement
  4. Program Review and Program Approval
  5. Funding
  6. Dr. Zimpher's Report/ Certification Standards
  7. Critical Shortages
  8. Florida Teacher Corp
  9. Promotion and Salary
  10. Community Colleges
  11. Vocational Certification
  12. Analyzing the Workplace
  13. Reduction in Tuition Costs for Teacher's Dependents

V. Adjournment — 7:00 p.m.

January 27th

I. Call to order, Review of Day's Activities — 8:30 a.m.

II. Continuation of January 26th general membership discussion — 8:40 a.m.

---LUNCH---
(12:00 - 1:00)

III. Discussion of Final Report
- Outline
- Recommendations — 1:00 p.m.

IV. Adjournment — 3:15 p.m.

Agenda

JOINT EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE TASK FORCE
FOR TEACHER EDUCATION QUALITY IMPROVEMENT

Thursday, February 10, 1983 -- 9:30 a.m. - 4:00 p.m.
Friday, February 11, 1983 -- 9:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m.
Senate Room A
Senate Office Building
Tallahassee, Florida

February 10

I.	Task Force Orientation to Public Hearing	9:30 a.m.
II.	Public Hearing	10:00 a.m.
III.	Lunch Break	12:00 a.m.
IV.	Public Hearing	1:30 p.m.
V.	Adjournment	4:00 p.m.

February 11

I.	Call to Order, Review of Minutes, Staff Update	9:00 a.m.
II.	Public Hearing: General Discussion	9:15 a.m.
III.	Lunch Break	11:45 a.m.
IV.	Public Hearing: General Discussion	1:00 p.m.
V.	Adjournment	2:00 p.m.

Agenda

JOINT EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE TASK FORCE
FOR TEACHER EDUCATION QUALITY IMPROVEMENT

Friday March 4, 1983
9:00 AM-2:00 PM
Room 215, House Office Building
Tallahassee, FL

I.	Call to Order, Review of Minutes, Staff Update	9:00 AM
II.	Staff Report on Visits to Various Post Secondary Institutions	9:15 AM
III.	Review of Final Report Draft and Discussion of Minority Report	9:30 AM
	LUNCH	
IV.	Identification of Implementation Tasks and Strategies	1:00 PM
V.	Adjournment	2:00 PM

Appendix B

INDIVIDUALS WHO MADE PRESENTATIONS TO TASK FORCE

INDIVIDUALS WHO MADE PRESENTATIONS TO TASK FORCE

Steve Altman
Vice President for Academic Affairs,
Florida International University

Michael Armstrong
Postsecondary Education Planning Commission

Neal Berger
Staff, House Committee on Education, K-12

Carl Blackwell
Budget Director, State University System

Robert Bryan
Vice President for Academic Affairs
University of Florida

Jack Gant
President, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and Dean of College of Education, Florida State University

James Geiger
1st Vice President, Florida Education Association/United

Cecil Golden
Florida Council on Educational Management

Jack Gordon
Chairperson, Senate Education Committee

Bob Graham
Governor of Florida

Richard Holihan
Education Standards Commission

Robert Howsam
University of Houston

Lou Kleinman
Dean, School of Education, University of Miami

Kenneth Buddy McKay
Southern Regional Education Board

Fred Milton
Department of Education, Program Approval

Barbara Newell
Chancellor, State University System

Leedell Neyland
Acting Vice-President for Academic Affairs, Florida A&M University

Michael O'Farrell
Staff Director, Senate Education Committee

Paul Parker
Department of Education, Community Colleges Division

Bruce Peseau
University of Alabama

William Proctor
President, Flagler College, Independent Colleges of Florida

Andrew Robinson
Institute of Education

Dale Scannell
Dean, School of Education, University of Kansas

B. O Smith
Professor Emeritus, University of South Florida

James Strange
Dean, College of Arts and Letters, University of South Florida

Garfield Wilson
Department of Education, Director of Teacher Education, Certification and Staff Development

Cy Wingrove
President, FTP-NEA

Appendix C

EXECUTIVE SUMMARIES OF CONSULTANTS' REPORTS

DIFFERENTIAL FUNDING FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

IN FLORIDA UNIVERSITIES

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This is a summary of the principal issues and findings of a study of the status, productivity, and funding of Teacher Education in nine public universities in Florida. The study was submitted in January, 1983 to the governance committee of the Joint Executive and Legislative Task Force for Teacher Education Quality Improvement. This summary includes five areas: (1) the principles of adequacy and equity in funding public education, (2) the judgments of leaders in Florida concerning Teacher Education, (3) an analysis of qualitative and quantitative data on Teacher Education in Florida, (4) comparisons with Teacher Education data nationally, and (5) problems and recommendations derived from 1-4, above.

Adequacy and Equity

The principles of adequacy and equity apply to the funding of all public services, including elementary-secondary and higher education, mental health, and other state functions. The adequacy of funding is a derivative of both how much money is available and cost standards based on past experience and national or regional comparisons. In funding public education in Florida, formula weights are used to differentiate the costs and complexity of programs in elementary-secondary schools. Forty-four weights are used to differentiate costs among regular, special, vocational, and other program types; these weights range from 1.000 to 16.000. Higher education also recognizes differentials according to discipline (Teacher Education, Engineering, Nursing, etc.) and level (lower division, upper division, graduate). The use of the weighting system has resulted in quite consistent costs per FTE student in basic K-12 programs throughout the public school systems. Such consistent patterns of expenditures are not evident throughout public higher education, however.

Throughout the U.S., the adequacy principle is applied by sharing the costs of public education. For elementary-secondary schools, the legislature authorizes funds from state revenues and the community is required to generate a minimally specified amount. In higher education, the legislature also authorizes state revenues and the universities are required to generate specified amounts through tuition charges to students.

The equity principle concerns how each school district, university, or individual student is assured its fair share of the resources available. These minimum foundations are intended to guarantee that every student, regardless of where he lives or to which program he is assigned or chooses, will have a minimally equitable amount to provide his educational services. Legislators make decisions based on the principles of adequacy and equity when they authorize

state funds to guarantee that the wealth of the state will support each student, some at a minimal level and others at higher levels because of their special handicaps or more complex and costly programs. This substantially reduces political favoritism. Moreover, the legislature exercises its oversight responsibility to ensure compliance with the intent of the legislators. This oversight is highly structured in the case of Florida elementary-secondary education, but very weak in relation to higher education.

Judgments of Leaders in Florida

Nineteen leaders from Florida public universities, the DOE, BOR, PEPC, and the legislative staff were interviewed. The focus was on qualitative and quantitative aspects of Teacher Education. The consensus of those judgments were that

1. There is a strong relationship between the resources and quality of university programs.

2. There is virtually no accountability required of universities on how funds are spent by programs.

3. Teacher Education probably generates far more resources than it receives as budgets.

4. Teacher Education is funded poorly because it is considered to be primarily classroom-didactic or nature.

5. The quality and extent of Teacher Education clinical experiences is deficient.

6. Teacher Education suffers from a very poor image within universities and the state, possibly because it has lacked adequate resources to do a better job.

7. Teacher Education is a legitimate and necessary function of universities, along with other professional programs.

8. Program quality reviews by the DOE and BOR reveal abundant and severe weaknesses of Teacher Education programs, but there has been no planned program to correct them.

9. Severe shortages exist in some K-12 teaching specializations, and this will probably become much worse soon.

10. Most university reward systems (promotion, tenure, salary) penalize Teacher Education for being more oriented to service to school systems than to publication productivity.

Teacher Education in Florida

Two Teacher Education program review reports considered to be typical were analyzed. These were completed by the DOE for all programs in April 1983. One program had 117 needed improvements cited and the other 99. These were identified as deficiencies, in equipment, materials, staffing to teach and supervise clinical experiences, support staff, and curriculum modernization. Correcting those deficiencies requires a planned program of improvement, adequate funding, and monitoring and evaluation of results.

Productivity and costs of academic programs are closely associated. Higher education data provided by the State University System shows that credit hour productivity standards per FTE faculty for Teacher Education are among the highest of all disciplines. The continued practice of incremental budgeting for previously underfunded Teacher Education programs only exacerbates problems of poor quality. Teacher Education is classified as the least costly and easiest to deliver, primarily through a classroom lecture mode. Florida Teacher Education programs produce seven times more upper division than lower division credit hours, yet it is compared to other programs which have lesser ratios. The cost per credit hour in Teacher Education among Florida's nine universities yields a ratio of as much as 7:1 from highest to lowest--more than for other disciplines. This is clear evidence that university administrators are permitted great discretion in deciding at what level their programs will be funded. If Florida Teacher Education students completed an academic year of coursework in their major college in 1980-81, the direct costs of instruction would have been only $787 at the lower division level, $1029 for upper division, and $1302 for graduate level. This compared with average annual direct costs of $1482 for K-12 regular students and $2122 for K-12 vocational programs. Even a year of graduate studies in Teacher Education was 12% less than for a regular K-12 student; the upper division cost was 31% less, and the lower division cost was 47% less.

Florida Teacher Education and National Data

Three Florida Teacher Education programs, at UF, FSU, and FAU provided data, along with 66 other universities in 37 states, for my annual studies of productivity and funding. Several primary indicators have been identified which relate resources to productivity. When these three Florida Teacher Education programs were compared to the other universities nationally, it revealed that the Florida programs had significantly higher levels of productivity and substantially less resources than the average. On 8 of the 15 productivity observations, two of the Florida programs ranked in the first and second stanines, or higher than 90% of all other universities. Florida programs achieved this with less funds for salaries, fewer support personnel, and less operating funds per FTE faculty. These Florida programs are seriously underfunded for what they produce, and it can be inferred that other Teacher Education programs in Florida are probably in the same or worse condition. Students in these Florida programs pay a much higher proportion of the direct costs of their education from their pockets in the form of tuition than the national average.

Problems and Recommendations

Teacher Education must be more clearly conceptualized and described as clinical, rather than classroom in mode. Once the nature of the program and its learning experiences is explained, it can be translated into staffing and other funding-related requirements. As a result, the program complexity and cost weights for Teacher Education should be significantly increased. Criteria for accomplishment of program objectives and evaluation of the quality of that achievement must be integral to program design, to ensure faculty and university accountability for the effective use of state funds.

Incremental budgeting of Teacher Education must be abandoned in favor of program budgeting. Minimum standards must be set for program costs, either on a per-SCH or per-FTE student basis, differentiated by level. The universities must be subjected to more specific legislative oversight to ensure that Teacher Education--and every academic program--receives an adequate and equitable share of the state funds. The priorities of university administrators should not supercede the intent of the Legislature. Every student, regardless of which academic major they choose or which university they attend, should be guaranteed a minimally adequate funding base to provide a quality program. Florida higher education can design criteria and processes for assessing the relationship between funding and productivity. Improved quality of Teacher Education and better teachers for Florida schools can result from that effort.

Bruce A. Peseau
University, Alabama
February 7, 1983.

TEACHER CERTIFICATION

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF REPORT
PREPARED FOR THE TASK FORCE BY
DR. NANCY LUSK ZIMPHER
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
JANUARY 1983

The report presents a national perspective of current issues related to teacher certification and teacher competence. It focuses on the nature of discontent over certification and quality issues and the call for reform from the public and the profession. Further the proposed measures for reform are cast in relation to the state's mandate to assure teacher competence and specific changes that are and can be made in certification procedures which could guarantee quality controls. Finally, reform measures which relate specifically to Florida certification are recommended by the consultant.

Current Ferment in Teacher Certification

In the mid-seventies there was a wave of teacher certification reform in Oregon, California, Kentucky, Minnesota and Ohio, particularly in regard to teacher certification control issues and the development of new standards for teacher preparation. In the late seventies and into the present, state reform is even more specific: South Carolina adopted the National Teachers Examination, the efficacy of which was appealed and approved by the Supreme Court. This activity was capped off by that state's adoption last year of the Educator Improvement Act -- an act which strengthened teacher training, certification, employment and evaluation procedures. In Oklahoma, Bill 1706 was used to raise standards, implement competency tests, and provide an internship and inservice. New York State formulated its own competency based teacher education program and wrote into law a multi-layer approach to teacher certification, including ultimately competency assessment. The combination of teacher shortages and lack of teacher quality have moved three states to make significant attempts at teacher competence rewards through merit pay, in California, Arizona and over the last year, in Texas. This long list of states where improvements have occurred would not be complete without recognition of Florida's accomplishments in this area, including the implementation of teacher competency tests, and an entry-year beginning teacher program.

State Control of Teacher Certification

The nature and weight of standards for certification as established in the fifty states vary, as do processes for procuring the certificate. Accordingly, certification processes in the states are administered by state education agencies, delegated such authority by state legislatures and state lay boards of education. The credentialing process typically includes an assessment of the university transcript of a teacher candidate against a particular set of course and experience requirements. A second, more typical vehicle for certification is referred to as the "approved program approach." In this case, the teacher candidate must be graduated from a teacher preparation institution which is "approved" by the state to prepare teachers. This being the case, the candidate is automatically certificated upon graduation. In the U.S., state systems for certification vary, as do the nature of various sets of standards and the preparation of teachers. To improve the mobility of a teacher from one state to another, there is reciprocity among 35 states. Such reciprocity allows certificate holders from one state to more easily procure a certificate to practice in another state.

In short, the state must assure the public that its teachers are personally fit and professionally competent; that is, that certification procedures produce teachers who meet minimal standards of professional competence. The major patterns of teacher certification practice include:

1. completion of specified courses
2. program approval procedures, relied upon at least partially in 46 states
3. written examinations (i.e., competency tests)
4. evaluation of competencies through competency-based teacher education programs.

Changes in Certification Procedures

This section of the report addresses the range of recommended changes which help states address their full responsibility to assure teacher personal fitness and professional competence.

a. Competency Testing

Testing for certification is a very popular improvement device which 18 states require or will require of applicants for teacher certification. Several states are using the National Teacher Examination which was created

in 1976; others have developed their own. Tests are used for mastery of subject matter and more frequently as a measure of competency of basic communication, computation, and pedagogical skills.

b. Raise Standard for Admission to Teacher Education

Efforts at high admission requirements are misguided if these requirements are not marked with incentives that will enhance recruitment procedures. Short of this combined effort, we do little more than create a teacher shortage.

In a recent proposal of the Council of Chief State School Officers (Scanlon, et al, 1982), a creation of teacher shortage is exactly the prescription for what ails the teaching profession. In short this proposal posits that state education departments deliberately create teacher shortages by raising the standards on skills tests...to force school districts to compete for the available teachers with higher wages, which in turn would attract higher caliber students into the profession.

c. Strengthening Program Approval

Specifically, state program approval places responsibility for assuring competence on the institution and presents assessment of a particular institution against a set of state views. The process needs standards which address empirically based criteria. In defense, of working toward more improved program approval mechanisms, the latitude offered by descriptive standards, as opposed to rules and prescriptions, given our still emerging knowledge base, allows the traditional pluralism of institutional preparation to flourish within a set of common standards. (Freeman, 1980)

Without creating unnecessarily arbitrary standards, the position of Freeman and others is that the state credentialing process can and ought to include a comprehensive and mandatory system for reviewing the process (i.e., the program) by which teachers become credentialed, by seeking institutional evidence of the reliability and validity of the training program toward the production of competent teachers.

d. The Entry Year Internship and Extended Programs

It is not hard to justify the expansion of teacher education programs if one only looks at recent legislation on the preparation of all teachers in working with mainstreamed students, or at the current social issues such as familiarity with cultural diversity, bilingual populations, or the increased emphasis at all levels on the basic skills. These extensions focus on the need for more real and simulated experiences for teachers, a movement fostered

by teachers who feel that a more theoretically based curriculum does not adequately prepare them for the reality of the classroom.

Other areas addressed in the report where changes can be made to strengthen teacher education and certification include inservice programs, teacher education curriculum, teacher incentives and rewards, and the standard reaction of specialization requirements.

Recommendations

In the final section of the report a recommendation was posed on behalf of the Joint Executive and Legislative Task Force for Teacher Education Quality Improvement that would involve policy decisions in the Florida legislature regarding teacher certification and teacher competence. Rather than proposing multiple recommendations that speak to separate issues raised in this report and by critical actors interviewed in the state, one omnibus recommendation is presented, with implications for each of the issues raised in the previous section.

> Because broad-based reform in the structure and operation of teacher education is the only effective vehicle for long-term improvement of the teaching force, the Task Force recommends a major redesign of the state's program approval process.
>
> Accordingly, public and private institutions within the state of Florida which offer teacher preparation programs shall stand for State Department of Education program approval at five-year intervals. Graduation from approved programs shall constitute the primary vehicle for acquiring an initial teaching certificate. Failure of a teacher candidate to be recommended for certification by the degree-granting institution will disallow the candidate from receiving a Florida initial teaching certificate.
>
> Standards for program approval shall be promulgated in the following areas:
>
> a. organization
> b. program
> c. faculty service
> d. student admission/retention and service
> e. resources and facilities
> f. evaluaton

Standards will reflect the emerging knowledge base in teacher education, and will provide for evaluation of potential and performance at 1) admission to the university, 2) admission to the teacher education program, 3) prior to student teaching, and 4) after demonstrated competence in a teaching position. All evaluative results will be a reflection on institutional and individual competence.

Administration of the program approval process will be the responsibility of the State Department of Education. Institutional visitation teams, representative of the profession shall provide for the standards validation function.

Because the development of new program approval standards will require significant redesign of teacher education programs in Florida institutions, the legislature shall provide enabling resources to assist universities in standards compliance. The redesign process, including the development of an agreed upon set of standards, shall be implemented with the next five years.

Appendix D

INDIVIDUALS TESTIFYING AT PUBLIC HEARING

Individuals Testifying at
Public Hearing
February 10, 1983

Dr. Carl Backman
Acting Dean of the College of Education, University of West Florida

Mr. Gordon Bensen
Educational Testing Service

Dr. Peter Cistone
Dean of the College of Education, Florida International University

Dr. James Coffee
Director of Teacher Education, Stetson University

Dr. Tom Denmark
Professor,Florida State University

Mr. Harrison Edinger
Teacher, Orange County Public Schools

Dr. Paul Eggen
Professor, University of North Florida

Dr. Tom Fisher
Administrator for Student Assessment Services, Department of Education

Dr. Jack Gant
Dean of the College of Education, Florida State University

Dr. Joseph Martin
Dean of the College of Education, Florida A&M University

Dr. Barbara Spector
Science Education Faculty, Florida International University

Dr. Stafford Thompson
Administrator for Program Development and Evaluation,
Division of Community Colleges, Department of Education

Dr. Garfield Wilson
Director of the Office of Teacher Education, Certification
and Staff Development, Department of Education

Mr. Cy Wingrove
President, FTP-NEA

Appendix E

SUMMARY CHARTS RELATED TO TEACHER EDUCATION
PROGRAM FUNDING

131

Summary Chart
Dr. Bruce Peseau's Analysis of
Teacher Education Expenditures

Three of Florida's public universities (University of Florida, Florida State University and Florida Atlantic University) supplied data for a national study of teacher education funding. The following chart compares results on selected variables from the three Florida institutions with national norms from sixty nine participating land grant institutions.

Cost per unweighted semester credit hour:

	Mean	Rank
Florida Institution A	53.27	18th
Florida Institution B	29.47	56th
Florida Institution C	23.84	63rd
National Mean	45.073	

Cost per undergraduate full time equivalent student:

	Mean	Rank
Florida Institution A	1662	18th
Florida Institution B	919	56th
Florida Institution C	744	63rd
National Mean	1406.27	

Unweighted semester credit hour per full time equivalent faculty:

	Mean	Rank
Florida Institution A	376.79	42nd
Florida Institution B	341.22	56th
Florida Institution C	333.72	58th
National Mean	430.537	

Weighted semester credit hours per full time equivalent faculty:

	Mean	Rank
Florida Institution A	702.31	53rd
Florida Institution B	1229.96	18th
Florida Institution C	1567.53	9th
National Mean	970.97	

Institutional Complexity Index (Productivity formula)

	Mean	Rank
Florida Institution A	1.76	49th
Florida Institution B	3.62	5th
Florida Institution C	4.70	1st
National Mean	2.33	

Tuition as percent of undergraduate academic year cost:

	Mean	Rank
Florida Institution A	.61	35th
Florida Institution B	1.34	5th
Florida Institution C	1.07	7th
National Mean	.684	

Average undergraduate class size:

	Mean	Rank
Florida Institution A	18.00	39th
Florida Institution B	16.34	43rd
Florida Institution C	33.09	1st
National Mean	18.476	

Average graduate class size:

	Mean	Rank
Florida Institution A	12.24	24th
Florida Institution B	5.61	56th
Florida Institution C	15.40	9th
National Mean	10.90	

Summary Chart -
Comparison of Teacher Education
and K-12 Student Cost

	TCHR. ED.	PUB. SCH.	TE% DIFF.
UF/LD	$ 784	$1482	-47
UD	1050		-29
FSU/LD	2162		+46
UD	1264		-15
FAMU/LD	311		-89
UD	1538		+04
USF/LD	1066		-28
UD	968		-35
FAU/LD	---		---
UD	1139		-23
UWF/LD	1045		-29
UD	1045		-29
UCF/LD	520		-65
UD	580		-61
FIU/LD	---		---
UD	997		-33
UNF/LD	---		---
UD	1014		-32
SUS/LD	$ 787	$1482	-47
SUS/UD	$1029	$1482	-31

Appendix F

1982-83 TEACHER SALARY
RANGES

MIS Statistical Brief

December, 1982 Series 83—138

State of Florida
Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida
Ralph D. Turlington, Commissioner

Affirmative action/equal opportunity employer

1982-83 TEACHER SALARY RANGES

The teacher salary ranges shown on the reverse side of this brief have been obtained from the salary schedules submitted annually by the Florida public school districts to the Division of Public Schools. These data have been analyzed to determine minimum and maximum salaries paid to instructional personnel; however, individual districts allow varying salary supplements which are not reflected in these figures.

NOTE: This Statistical Brief will supply the user with the most recent data available pertaining to teacher salaries. For further information, please contact Virginia Barnes, Educational Data Analyst, Education Information Services/Management Information Systems, Program Support Services, 275 Knott Building, Tallahassee, Florida 32301, Ph. (904) 487-2280.

DIVISION OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Education Information Services

FLORIDA: A STATE OF EDUCATIONAL DISTINCTION. "On a statewide average, educational achievement in the State of Florida will equal that of the upper quartile of states within five years, as indicated by commonly accepted criteria of attainment."

Adopted, State Board of Education, Jan. 20, 1981

FLORIDA

1982-83 TEACHER SALARY RANGES

	BACHELOR's		MASTER's		SPECIALIST		DOCTORATE	
	MIN	MAX	MIN	MAX	MIN	MAX	MIN	MAX
ALACHUA	12,521	22,419	13,833	24,768	14,906	26,689	16,099	28,824
BAKER	12,900	17,755	14,100	18,955	14,700	19,555	15,300	20,155
BAY	13,529	21,330	14,701	22,501	15,522	23,323	16,443	24,144
BRADFORD	12,300	18,110	13,450	19,260	14,100	19,910	14,900	20,710
BREVARD	14,000	20,600	15,400	22,000	16,000	22,600	16,600	23,200
BROWARD *	11,558	22,800	13,018	24,260	13,400	20,953	15,478	26,720
CALHOUN	13,200	19,000	14,200	20,000	14,900	20,700	15,600	21,400
CHARLOTTE	12,858	19,802	14,839	21,783	15,887	22,731	16,882	23,826
CITRUS	12,550	18,449	14,433	20,331	15,515	21,856	16,679	23,495
CLAY	13,400	20,000	14,100	21,000	14,800	21,400	--	--
COLLIER	13,900	21,935	14,445	24,610	15,445	25,610	16,245	26,410
COLUMBIA	13,000	19,600	14,730	21,330	15,530	22,130	16,330	22,930
DADE	14,229	23,395	17,229	26,395	18,829	27,995	20,429	29,595
DE SOTO	12,947	19,500	13,947	20,500	14,947	21,500	15,947	22,500
DIXIE	12,250	16,500	13,400	17,650	14,088	18,975	14,700	19,800
DUVAL	13,000	21,764	13,900	23,378	14,900	24,151	15,800	25,203
ESCAMBIA	11,654	20,814	12,936	22,096	13,402	22,562	14,218	23,378
FLAGLER	11,500	17,200	12,500	18,200	13,000	19,700	--	--
FRANKLIN	11,128	16,163	12,686	17,721	13,799	20,042	14,912	21,659
GADSDEN *	11,700	17,500	12,700	18,500	13,200	19,000	13,800	19,600
GILCHRIST	12,000	17,800	13,500	19,300	14,000	19,800	14,500	20,300
GLADES	12,840	20,521	14,338	22,091	15,836	22,661	--	--
GULF	12,400	18,000	13,800	19,400	14,510	20,110	15,400	21,000
HAMILTON	12,000	18,000	13,000	19,000	13,300	19,300	13,500	19,500
HARDEE	13,070	19,500	14,380	20,810	--	--	--	--
HENDRY	13,000	20,200	14,090	21,290	14,650	21,850	--	--
HERNANDO	13,000	19,158	14,307	20,465	14,634	20,792	14,961	21,119
HIGHLANDS	13,000	19,620	13,800	20,420	14,600	21,220	16,200	22,820
HILLSBOROUGH	13,000	21,100	14,087	22,187	14,631	22,731	15,173	23,273
HOLMES *	11,002	16,308	12,002	17,308	12,502	17,808	13,002	18,308
INDIAN RIVER	12,636	20,000	13,736	21,100	14,286	21,650	14,836	22,200
JACKSON	12,400	18,600	14,100	20,400	15,700	21,900	16,800	23,000
JEFFERSON *	10,221	15,628	11,101	16,508	11,981	17,388	12,861	18,628
LAFAYETTE	11,800	16,638	13,098	17,936	--	--	--	--
LAKE	12,700	20,530	14,190	22,020	15,000	22,830	--	--
LEE	13,000	20,730	14,400	22,130	15,500	23,230	16,300	24,030
LEON	12,050	20,063	13,376	21,389	14,460	22,473	15,063	23,076
LEVY	12,450	20,667	13,820	22,037	14,131	22,348	14,567	22,784
LIBERTY *	11,050	15,885	12,050	16,885	12,550	17,385	13,050	17,885
MADISON	12,000	16,875	13,125	18,000	13,600	18,475	--	--
MANATEE	13,160	20,571	14,888	22,730	--	--	--	--
MARION	12,000	19,750	12,600	21,250	13,400	22,700	--	--
MARTIN	13,405	20,452	14,515	21,562	15,241	22,640	15,967	23,718
MONROE	14,750	20,000	15,750	22,000	16,425	22,575	16,810	23,210
NASSAU	12,432	18,903	13,732	20,203	--	--	--	--
OKALOOSA	13,265	20,832	13,265	21,832	14,265	22,832	15,265	23,832
OKEECHOBEE	12,296	19,411	13,196	20,311	13,896	21,011	--	--
ORANGE	12,500	20,985	13,900	22,385	14,600	23,085	15,300	23,785
OSCEOLA	12,407	22,651	14,049	24,293	14,990	25,234	--	--
PALM BEACH	12,600	21,605	14,100	23,105	15,400	24,405	16,800	25,805
PASCO	13,000	20,806	14,210	21,981	14,963	22,382	15,766	23,185
PINELLAS	13,000	22,200	14,100	22,950	14,750	23,600	15,400	24,250
POLK	13,000	21,550	14,000	22,750	14,800	23,450	15,400	23,950
PUTNAM	13,000	18,600	14,000	20,300	14,600	20,900	15,200	21,500
ST. JOHNS	13,000	14,500	14,000	15,500	--	--	--	--
ST. LUCIE	13,750	20,873	15,125	22,550	16,115	22,990	16,555	23,430
SANTA ROSA *	11,768	20,172	13,064	21,713	13,820	22,469	14,576	23,225
SARASOTA	12,510	20,391	13,886	23,519	--	--	16,638	24,269
SEMINOLE	12,700	21,971	14,732	24,003	16,129	25,400	--	--
SUMTER	13,050	20,050	14,150	21,350	14,650	21,950	--	--
SUWANNEE	12,650	18,608	14,095	20,053	14,650	20,608	15,250	21,208
TAYLOR	11,700	19,364	13,221	20,885	14,391	22,055	15,561	23,225
UNION	12,200	19,350	13,300	20,450	--	--	--	--
VOLUSIA	12,197	22,381	13,905	24,089	14,636	24,821	15,246	25,430
WAKULLA	11,880	16,740	12,900	17,840	13,880	18,740	14,380	19,240
WALTON	13,000	19,200	13,800	20,000	14,600	20,800	--	--
WASHINGTON	12,067	18,659	13,427	20,021	14,105	20,700	14,786	21,380

*1981-82 Salary Ranges - Contract For 1982-83 Under Negotiation

Appendix G

COMMUNITY COLLEGE
EDUCATION-RELATED
COURSE OFFERINGS

COMMUNITY COLLEGE
EDUCATION-RELATED
COURSE OFFERINGS

AREA/COURSE TITLE	COMMUNITY COLLEGES	YEAR
A. EDUCATION FOR EXCEPTIONAL STUDENTS		
1) Orientation	Central Florida	1
	Edison	2
	Florida Jr. College at Jacksonville	1
	Miami-Dade	2
	Santa Fe	1
2) Basic Background in Basic Education	Indian River	1
3) Introduction to Special Education	Okaloosa-Walton	2
	Pensacola	2
4) Techniques for Facility Development of Exceptional Children	Santa Fe	1
5) Instructional Materials in Special Education	Santa Fe	2
6) Basic Behavioral Management	Santa Fe	1
7) Classroom Management Techniques	Santa Fe	1
8) Interdisciplinary Aspects of Exceptional Child Education	Santa Fe	2
9) Workshop Disadvantaged	Miami-Dade	2
10) Seminar on Exceptional Child Development	Miami-Dade	2
11) Basic Practicum on Special Education	Santa Fe	2
12) Directed Individual Study	Santa Fe	2
13) Group Study	Santa Fe	1
14) Hearing Orientation	Florida Jr. College at Jacksonville	1
15) Introduction to Interpretation	Florida Jr. College at Jacksonville	1

AREA/COURSE TITLE	COMMUNITY COLLEGES	YEAR
16) Specific Learning Disabilities	Manatee	2
	Polk	2
17) Visually Impaired Orientation	Edison	2
B. FOUNDATIONS		
1) Introduction to Foundations	Brevard	1
	Broward	2
	Chipola	1
	Daytona Beach	1
	Edison	2
	Florida Junior College at Jacksonville	1
	Florida Keys	1
	Gulf Coast	2
	Hillsborough	1
	Indian River	2
	Lake City	1
	Lake Sumter	2
	Manatee	1
	Dade	1
	Okaloosa-Walton	1
	Palm Beach	1
	Pasco-Hernando	1
	Pensacola	1
	Polk	1
	Santa Fe	1 (2)*
	South Florida	2
	St. Pete	1
	Valencia	1

*Numbers in parenthesis reflect number of courses offered

AREA/COURSE TITLE	COMMUNITY COLLEGES	YEAR
2) Educational Survey	Lake Sumter	2
3) Introduction to Early Childhood: Social Issues	Indian River	1
4) Values	Gulf Coast	2
5) Human Development	Indian River	2
6) Educational Psychology	Broward	2
7) Introduction to Classroom Management	Daytona Beach	2
	Hillsborough	1
	Manatee	1
8) Measurement	Broward	1
9) History of Education	Daytona Beach	2
	Manatee	2
	South Florida	1
10) Education in Israel I	Broward	2
	Brevard	2
11) Education in Israel II	Broward	2
	Brevard	2
12) Current Issues	Santa Fe	2
C. GUIDANCE		
1) Personality Development and Adjustment	Daytona Beach	2
D. SCIENCE		
1) Chemistry Institute	Polk	1 (2)*
	Polk	2 (2)
2) Science for Elementary Education	Florida Junior College at Jacksonville	2
3) Teaching Concepts	Santa Fe	1
E. ELEMENTARY		
1) Introduction to Elementary Education	Polk	2 (2)
2) Bilingual Elementary	Pasco-Hernando	1 (2)

AREA/COURSE TITLE	COMMUNITY COLLEGES	YEAR
	Pasco-Hernando	1 (2)*
3) Elementary Curriculum	Central Florida	1
F. GENERAL EDUCATION		
1) Teaching as a Career	North Florida	1
2) Teacher's Aide	Daytona Beach	1
	Edison	2
3) Survey	North Florida	2
4) Education Instruction I	Polk	2
Education Instruction II	Polk	2
5) Introduction to Education Methods	Brevard	2
	Lake City	2
6) Management	Pasco-Hernando	1
	Polk	1
7) Teacher's Assistant Programs I & II	Daytona Beach	2 (2)
	Manatee	2 (3)
	Daytona Beach	1
	Pasco-Hernando	1 (4)
8) Teacher Capability Development	Daytona Beach	1
9) Teaching Multicultural Education: Social Perspective	Miami-Dade	2 (2)
10) Instructional Design Seminar	Indian River	2
11) Internship in Education	Edison	2 (2)
Internship in Education for Aides	Pasco-Hernando	1
	Polk	2
12) Various Educational Experiences	Miami-Dade	2
13) Work Experiences Cooperative	Brevard	2
	Daytona Beach	2
	Lake Sumter	2
	St. Johns	2
G. EARLY CHILDHOOD	Broward	1 (5)
	Central Florida	2 (3)
	Central Florida	1
	Edison	2
	Florida Jr. College at Jacksonville	1 (3)
	Hillsborough	1 (6), 2 (2)

*Numbers in parenthesis reflect number of courses offered

AREA/COURSE TITLE	COMMUNITY COLLEGES	YEAR
	Indian River	1 (2)*
	Manatee	2 (3)
	Miami-Dade	1 (2)
		2 (2)
	Palm Beach	1, 2 (3)
	Pasco-Hernando	1,2
	Santa Fe	1 (2)
		2 (3)
	St. Pete	1 (5), 2 (5)
H. EDUCATION TECHNOLOGY		
1) Orientation	Chipola	2
	Daytona Beach	2
	Miami-Dade	2
	North Florida	2
	Pensacola	2
	Polk	1, 2 (4)
2) Audio Visual Instruction	Broward	2
	Miami-Dade	2
I. VOCATIONAL INDUSTRIAL	Hillsborough	2 (7)
	Pensacola	1 (8)
	Pensacola	2 (4)
I. ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE (ESL)	Brevard	1 (2)
	Broward	1 (5)
	Edison	1 (2)
		1 (2)
	Miami-Dade	1 (21)
	Santa Fe	1
	St. Johns	1
J. MATH EDUCATION		
1) Elementary	Brevard	1
	Chipola	2
	Daytona Beach	1
	Edison	2
	Gulf Coast	1

*Numbers in parenthesis reflect number of courses offered

AREA/COURSE TITLE	COMMUNITY COLLEGES	YEAR
	Indian River	2
	Lake City	2
	Manatee	2 (4) *
	Miami-Dade	2 (4)
	North Florida	2 (2)
	Okaloosa-Walton	1, 2
	Pasco-Hernando	1
	Polk	2 (4)
	Santa Fe	2
	St. Johns	2
	Valencia	2
K. SOCIAL STUDIES		
1) Elementary Education	Polk	2 (4)
L. COMPARATIVE PSYCHOLOGY		
1) Elementary Adjustment and Introduction to Psychology	Pensacola	2
	Polk	2
	Santa Fe	1 (3)
	St. Johns	2
	St. Johns	1, 2
	Tallahassee	1
	Valencia	1
	Pensacola	2
	Broward	1
	Daytona Beach	1, 2
	Hillsborough	1
	Gulf Coast	1, 2
	Miami-Dade	2
	North Florida	2
	Okaloosa-Walton	1
2) Field Work	Pensacola	2
3) Introduction to Developmental Psychology: Adolescence, Adult and Child	Brevard	
	Central Florida	
	Edison	
	Florida Jr. College at Jacksonville	

*Numbers in parenthesis reflect number of courses offered

AREA/COURSE TITLE	COMMUNITY COLLEGES	YEAR
	Miami-Dade	
	Broward	
	Daytona Beach	
	Chipola	
	Florida Keys	
	Gulf Coast	
	Hillsborough	
	Lake-Sumter	
	Manatee	
	Okaloosa-Walton	
	Palm Beach	
	Pasco-Hernando	
	Pensacola	
	Polk	
	Santa Fe	
	South Florida	
	St. Johns	
	St. Pete	
	Valencia	
	Lake City	
	Seminole	
	Tallahassee	
4) Education Psychology	Daytona Beach	2
	Edison	2
	Florida Junior College at Jacksonville	2
	Indian River	2
	Lake City	2
	Manatee	2
	North Florida	2
	Okaloosa-Walton	2
	Palm Beach	2
	Santa Fe	2
	St. Johns	2
	St. Johns	2

AREA/COURSE TITLE	COMMUNITY COLLEGES	YEAR
	St. Pete	2
	Valencia	2
5) Applied Psychology for Elementary Education	Broward	2
	Daytona Beach	2
	Gulf Coast	2
	Manatee	2
	Pensacola	(2)*
	Polk	2
	St. Johns	2
	St. Pete	2
4) Basic Counseling	Broward	2
	Miami-Dade	1
	Santa Fe	2 (2)
5) Personality	Florida Keys	2
	Indian River	2
	Miami-Dade	2 (2)
	Polk	2
	St. Pete	2
M. PHYSICAL EDUCATION		
1) Officiating	Brevard	
	Central Florida	
	Edison	
	Florida Junior College at Jacksonville	
	Miami-Dade	
	Broward	
	Indian River	
	Daytona Beach	
	Chipola	
	Gulf Coast	
	Hillsborough	
	Lake-Sumter	
	Manatee	
	Okaloosa-Walton	
	Pasco-Hernando	

*Number in parenthesis reflect number of courses offered

AREA/COURSE TITLE	COMMUNITY COLLEGES	YEAR
	Pensacola	
	Polk	
	Santa Fe	
	South Florida	
	Lake City	
	Seminole	
	North Florida	
2) Coaching (various sports)	Broward	1, 2 (3) *
	Central Florida	2
	Daytona Beach	2 (2)
	Edison	2 (8)
	Gulf Coast	2 (5)
	Manatee	2 (5)
	Miami-Dade	2 (9)
	Okaloosa-Walton	1 (2)
	Palm Beach	2 (2)

*Numbers in parenthesis reflect number of courses offered

Appendix H

TASK FORCE SURVEYS

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION PLANNING COMMISSION
KNOTT BUILDING
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32301

TASK FORCE FOR
TEACHER EDUCATION
QUALITY IMPROVEMENT

Telephone (904) 488-0981

November 19, 1982

Dear Dean, Director, or Chairperson of Teacher Education Program:

Enclosed please find copies of the Faculty Survey for you to distribute to each member of your faculty. This survey can be returned directly to us in the attached envelopes.

We appreciate your assistance in this effort. Please encourage your faculty to complete and return this survey by December 21st, so that the Task Force will have the valuable input from practicing teacher educators at your institution.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Armando Henriquez

Dr. Armando Henriquez, Chairperson
Task Force for Teacher Education
Quality Improvement

AH/lr/mm

Affirmative action/equal opportunity employer

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION PLANNING COMMISSION
KNOTT BUILDING
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32301

TASK FORCE FOR
TEACHER EDUCATION
QUALITY IMPROVEMENT

Telephone (904) 488-0981

November 19, 1982

Dear Faculty Member:

It is anticipated that during the 1983 legislative session serious attention will be given to teacher preparation programs in Florida. The Joint Legislative and Executive Task Force on Teacher Education Quality Improvement was established and requested by the 1982 Legislature to provide a report with legislative and policy recommendations by March 1, 1983. At present the Task Force is in the process of securing data on Florida's teacher education programs from a variety of sources. Given our short time-frame, it is the intent of the Task Force to obtain and provide to the legislature the most accurate information available on Florida's preservice teacher education programs. The counsel from faculty, program heads, and deans and directors of teacher education programs is essential as the group begins to develop and establish recommendations.

As part of this activity, we are asking you to complete the items on the attached faculty survey. Part A of this survey asks for data on your personal background and experiences. Part B requests that you provide your perceptions on the policy making procedures at your institution with regard to curriculum and program changes, and also asks you to share your perceptions on promotion and tenure procedures at your institution. The results of this survey will be shared with all deans, directors, and chairpersons of teacher education programs. INDIVIDUAL FACULTY ANONYMITY WILL BE PROTECTED.

Please complete this survey by December 21st and mail it in the enclosed envelope to: Dr. Richard Alterman, Project Director, 109 Knott Building, Tallahassee, FL 32301.

We do realize that this is a busy time of year; however, our deadline for submitting a report to the legislature is rapidly approaching.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Armando Henriquez

Dr. Armando Henriquez, Chairperson
Task Force for Teacher Education
Quality Improvement

AH/rca/mm

Affirmative action/equal opportunity employer

FACULTY SURVEY

Name of Institution _____

Name, Title of Office _____

Address of Person Completing this Survey _____

_____

Telephone _____

Part A

1. a. Do you have public school teaching experience? yes _____ no _____

   b. If so, for how many years full-time? _____

   c. If so, at what grade level(s) did you teach? _____

   _____

   d. If so, what subject(s) did you teach? _____

   _____

2. a. Do you have public school administration experience? yes _____ no _____

   b. If so, for how many years full-time? _____

   c. If so, at what level? elementary _____ secondary _____ middle _____

3. Do you have any private school teaching experience? yes _____ no _____

4. Do you currently hold a valid Florida teaching certificate? yes _____ no _____

5. Briefly describe the staff development activities in which you were enrolled as a participant during the past year. (Do not include those which you conducted).

   _____

   _____

   _____

Part B

1. Are the procedures for making major policy decisions regarding changes in teacher education programs effective at your institution? (Yes/No) _____.

   What recommendations would you suggest for improvement?

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

2. In your opinion, are the promotion/salary decisions at your institution made on appropriate criteria? (Yes/No) _____. If NO, what changes would you suggest?

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

3. List the suggestions you have for improving the quality of the teacher education programs.

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION PLANNING COMMISSION
KNOTT BUILDING
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32301

TASK FORCE FOR
TEACHER EDUCATION
QUALITY IMPROVEMENT

Telephone (904) 488-0981

November 19, 1982

Dear Dean, Director, or Chairperson of Teacher Education Program:

It is anticipated that during the 1983 legislative session serious attention will be given to teacher preparation programs in Florida. The Joint Legislative and Executive Task Force on Teacher Education Quality Improvement was established and requested by the 1982 Legislature to provide a report with legislative and policy recommendations by March 1, 1983. At present the Task Force is in the process of securing data on Florida's teacher education programs from a variety of sources. Given our short time-frame, it is the intent of the Task Force to obtain and provide to the legislature the most accurate information available on Florida's preservice teacher education programs. The counsel from faculty, program heads, and deans and directors of teacher education programs is essential as the group begins to develop and establish recommendations.

As part of this activity we request and urge you to complete the attached white survey for deans, directors, or chairs of teacher education program. In addition, we have enclosed a pink survey for you to give to the chairperson of your elementary education program; a blue survey for you to give to the chairperson of your secondary education program; and a green survey for you to give to your exceptional student education program. Further, a faculty survey is being sent to you under separate cover for each faculty member at your institution.

As you know, our deadline of March 1, 1983 is rapidly approaching. Therefore, we would certainly appreciate your assistance to encourage faculty and program chairpersons to complete their instruments. The Task Force plans to share the results of the survey upon completion and will protect the confidentiality of all faculty so concerned.

Please return the completed instruments in the enclosed envelope by December 21st. Mail them to: Dr. Richard Alterman, 109 Knott Building, Tallahassee, FL 32301.

If you should have any questions please call Dr. Alterman at 904-488-0981.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Dr. Armando Henriquez, Chairperson
Task Force for Teacher Education Quality Improvement

AH/rca/mm

Affirmative action/equal opportunity employer

GENERAL TEACHER EDUCATION INFORMATION

(To be completed by Dean, Director or Chair of Teacher Education Program)

NOTE: If you do not possess the specific information requested, please so indicate. If the information requested is not now available, but you can estimate, please do so and indicate that the response is an estimate.

Name of Institution _____

Name, Title, Address of Dean of School College of Education

_____

_____

_____

A. Faculty Profile

1. How many full-time faculty are in your Department/College/School of Education?

   Assistant _____ Associate _____ Full _____ Tenured _____

2. How many of these faculty have: Doctorate _____ Masters _____

3. How many of these faculty are involved in teaching any preservice teacher preparation courses?

   Assistant _____ Associate _____ Full _____ Tenured _____

4. Of the faculty involved in teaching in the preservice teacher preparation program, how many are on soft lines? _____

5. How many adjunct faculty are teaching preservice teacher education courses?

   Doctorate _____ Masters _____

6. How many liberal arts faculty are directly involved in delivering preservice teacher education courses? _____

7. How many faculty are directly involved in supervising student teaching?

   Full-time _____ Adjunct _____ Tenured _____

8. How many faculty are involved in activities organized through Teacher Education Centers?

   Assistant _____ Associate _____ Full _____ Adjunct _____ Tenured _____

9. How many faculty have been trained to participate in the Beginning Teacher Program? _____

10. Which staff development policies do you have?

Sabbatical _____ Redirection _____ Other (please describe) _____

_____

11. Are faculty required to participate in staff development activities?
Yes _____ No _____

B. Student Profile

1. What is the mean score on SAT _____ or ACT _____ for your entering teacher candidates?

2. Of those students entering teacher preparation courses in the Department/College/School of Education in Fall 1981 who took the SAT Exam, how many earned a score of:

Below 835	_____
835 - 899	_____
900 - 999	_____
1000 - 1099	_____
1100 or above	_____
Total	100%

3. Of those studetns entering teacher preparation courses in the Department/College/School of Education in Fall 1982 who took the SAT Exam, how many earned a score of:

Below 835	_____
835 - 899	_____
900 - 999	_____
1000 - 1099	_____
1100 or above	_____
Total	100%

4. What percentage of your students entering teacher preparation programs in the Department/College/School of Education in the Fall 1981 who took the ACT Exam, earned a score of:

16 or below	_____
17 - 19	_____
20 - 23	_____
24 - 27	_____
28 - 30	_____
31 or above	_____
Total	100%

5. What percentage of your students entering teacher preparation programs in the Department/College/School of Education in the Fall 1982 who took the ACT Exam, earned a score of:

16 or below	_____
17 - 19	_____
20 - 23	_____
24 - 27	_____
28 - 30	_____
31 or above	_____
Total	100%

155

6. What percentage of your junior level students enrolled in teacher preparation programs in the Department/College/School of Education in the Fall 1981 had a cumulative GPA in the range of:

1.9 or below	_____
2.0 - 2.4	_____
2.5 - 2.9	_____
3.0 - 3.4	_____
3.5 or above	_____
Total	100%

7. What percentage of your junior level students enrolled in teacher preparation programs in the Department/College/School of Education in the Fall 1982 had a cumulative GPA in the range of:

1.9 or below	_____
2.0 - 2.4	_____
2.5 - 2.9	_____
3.0 - 3.4	_____
3.5 or above	_____
Total	100%

C. Standards for Admission, Selection and Retention of Teacher Candidates

1. Admission into Programs

a. State Board of Education rule 6A-5.62 requires a minimum composite score of 835 on SAT or 17 on ACT as a prerequisite for admission into teacher education. Does the admission score required by your institution exceed this minimum level? (Yes/No) _____.
If YES, state the composite score(s) which your institution requires for admission into Teacher Education. _____

b. If students do not meet minimum admission score requirements, is remediation recommended? (Yes/No) _____. If YES, describe how remediation opportunities are provided.

_____

_____

_____

c. For what percentage of your students, if any, have these SAT/ACT requirements been waived? _____

d. What criteria do you use in determining to waive these requirements?

_____

_____

_____

e. What is the racial/ethnic composition of those students for whom these requirements have been waived (% of Blacks, Whites, Hispanics, Native Americans, Asians)?

_____

_____

_____

f. What additional admission requirements does your institution require for entry into the teacher education program (e.g. minimum grade point average, basic skills competencies, etc.)? Please describe briefly.

_____

_____

_____

g. In your opinion, do you believe the CLAST test will have an effect on your current requirements or the quantity and caliber of students entering your teacher education program? (Yes/No) _____. If YES, please describe.

_____

_____

_____

2. Screening and Placement

a. Describe the procedure(s) you presently use for screening candidates who wish to enter your teacher education program.

_____

_____

_____

b. Once admitted to a teacher education program, do you employ any ongoing evaluative procedures or screening/guidance mechanisms to insure teacher candidate quality (e.g., periodic interviews, tests, observations, GPA maintenance levels)?

_____

_____

_____

3. Exit and Retention

a. What is the attrition rate for students leaving the programs of teacher education at your institution? _____. Of those who leave, what percentage exit due to failure to maintain minimum academic requirements? _____. What percentage exit to pursue other fields of study? ____.

b. Do you require exit tests for completion of your programs in teacher education? (Yes/No) _____. If YES, what types of tests do you employ?

_____

_____

_____

c. What percentage of students pass your exit tests on first attempt? _____. Do you allow successive attempts? (Yes/No) _____. If YES, how many? _____.

d. On the first attempt in 1981/82, what percentage of graduates from your programs of teacher education pass the Florida Teacher Certification Exam? _____.

D. Promotion & Salary

1. Please provide a copy of policy guidelines regarding promotion, salary, tenure and merit pay at your institution.

2. What recommendations would you suggest to improve the salary and promotion system at your institution? (Attach additional sheet if necessary)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

E. Governance

1. Is there a formal group at your institution charged with responsibility for making major policy decisions effecting change in teacher education programs and curriculum? (Yes/No) _____.

2. If, YES do members of that group include representatives of: (check all that apply)

_____ department/college/school of education faculty

_____ department/college/school of education administrators

_____ liberal arts faculty

_____ liberal arts administrators

_____ institution level administrators

_____ students

_____ teachers

_____ State Department of Education representatives

_____ others (please specify)_____

_____

_____

3. Please provide examples of major changes within the last two years made as a result of activities of this policy group.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

4. Are the majority of changes made in teacher education programs at your institution the result of this group's activity? (Yes/No) _____. If NO, what are the major forces contributing to change?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

5. What formal mechanisms are used to encourage collaborative planning?

   a. Between your teacher education programs? _____

   _____

   _____

   b. Between teacher education programs and public schools? _____

   _____

   _____

   c. Between education faculty and liberal arts faculty? _____

   _____

   _____

6. What recommendations would you make to improve the policy-making and collaborative activities in your teacher education programs?

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

Survey of Elementary/Secondary and Exceptional

Student Education Programs

Please complete the items on the attached pages concerning programs in elementary education on your campus. If you have no specific programs in elementary education, please so indicate below and return the forms uncompleted.

Please be as brief and specific as possible. If you do not possess the specific information requested, please so indicate. If the information requested is not now available, but you can estimate, please do so and indicate that the response is an estimate.

Please complete this section at your earliest possible convenience and return the completed form to the office of the dean, director, or chair of teacher education so that it can be mailed together with the other sections of the teacher education survey to Task Force staff, no later than December 21, 1982.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Name of Institution _____

We have programs in elementary education:

Yes _____ (Please complete attached pages)

No _____ (Please return form uncompleted)

Name, Title, and Office Address of Person Completing This Section

_____

_____

_____

Telephone _____

SURVEY OF ELEMENTARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS

I. How many upper level liberal arts courses are available for students in your program?

Electives _____ Required _____

II. Please list the appropriate course number within which the following subject areas are taught or specifically addressed. If they are not covered, please mark N/C.

AREA	Prefix and Course or N/C	% of Time in Course Spent on Topic
1) Contemporary Issues in Education		
2) Computer Literacy		
3) Economic Education		
4) School Law		
5) Environmental Education		
6) Sex Education		
7) Multicultural Education		
8) Urban/Inner-city Education		
9) Learning disabilities		
10) Counseling for classroom teachers		
11) Global/International Education		
12) Teacher stress/burnout		
13) Educational Technology		
14) Assessment of quality in texts		
15) Classroom Organization and Administration		
16) Evaluation		
17) Verbal and non-verbal communication		
18) Presentation of subject matter		
19) Bilingual Education		

20) Management of Student Behavior _____ _____

21) Coursework planning _____ _____

22) Gifted Student Education _____ _____

23) P.L. 94-142 _____ _____

III. The following questions concern CLINICAL, EARLY FIELD EXPERIENCES, and STUDENT TEACHING/INTERNSHIP. To the best of your ability, would you please briefly describe the typical experience of elementary education students for the categories listed below:

A. Clinical (campus-based) experiences

Type	Total Hours	Credit	Academic Level Offered (e.g. 1st semester junior year)

1. How many hours of clinical teaching are required prior to student teaching/internship? _____

B. Early Field Experiences (school-based, short duration and return to campus)

If you provide this type of pre-intern experience, please respond to the following:

Type	Total Hours	Credit	Academic Level Offered (e.g. 1st semester junior year)

1. How are school-based supervising teachers selected?

_____

_____

_____

2. On the average, how many hours of contact occur between the school-based supervising teacher and the university-based supervisory professor?

_____

3. How are students in early field experiences evaluated by supervising teachers? (e.g., checklist of competencies, professional judgement, etc.)

_____

_____

4. How often, and in what manner, do university supervising professors consult individually with students?

   a. Type of consultation? _____

   b. With what frequency and for how long? _____

5. Are students required to do early field experiences in multi-cultural school settings? (Yes/No) _____.

   If YES, what is the nature of this requirement?

_____

_____

_____

6. How many hours in early field experiences are required prior to student teaching internship?

_____

C. Student Teaching/Internship

Please answer the following questions regarding the scope and character of your student intern program. We realize it is difficult to generalize to all students, so when answering please approximate the typical experience encountered by your interns.

1. What is the nature of the student intern experience?

   a. Duration of experience? _____

   B. Number of hours required per semester/qtr? _____

2. On the average, does this experience take place in more than one school? (If so, how many schools)

3. Does it take place within one or more grade levels? (Please specify number of grade levels)

4. Does it cover more than one subject matter area? (Please specify subject matter(s) taught)

5. What are the criteria used for placing student interns in schools? (e.g. random allocation, student selection of school, etc.)

6. What criteria are used by school-based personnel to evaluate interns? (please list or attach copy of criteria)

7. How are school-based supervisory teachers selected?

8. On the average, how many hours of contact occur between a school-based supervising teacher and university supervisor?

9. How much, and what kind, of contact occurs between a student intern and the supervising university professor?

   a. Type of contact (e.g., meetings at student's school)

   b. Frequency and length of contacts?

10. Do you have requirements that insure student interns have a multicultural student teaching experience?

_____

If so, what are those requirements?

_____

_____

_____